

AN
EXAMINATION
OF THE
FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CHAPTERS
OF
Mr. GIBBON'S HISTORY
OF THE

Decline and Fall of the ROMAN EMPIRE.

In which HIS VIEW of the
PROGRESS of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION
Is shewn to be founded on the MISREPRESENTATION
of the AUTHORS he cites :

AND
Numerous Instances of his INACCURACY and PLAGIA-
RISM are produced.

By HENRY EDWARDS DAVIS, B.A.
OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

"When at every Step—I find you misquoting the Words, and misrepresenting the Sense of the Authors, it is not in my Power (I confess) to think you a fair and impartial Writer." *Bp. PEARCE's Reply to Dr. MIDDLETON.*

"Ne gloriari libeat alienis bonis." PRÆDUS.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR J. DODSLEY, IN PAUL-MALL.

MDCCLXXVIII.

Eng. Lib.

Hill

6-3:44

17741

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE whole of this work was printed off before I perused Dr. *Chelsum's* second edition of his *Remarks*, and Mr. *Burgh's* "Inquiry into the Belief of the first Christians," &c. But though I now find, that some few of my observations had occurred to these gentlemen; so extensive a list of Mr. G.'s *misrepresentations, inaccuracies, and plagiarisms* remained untouched by them, or by others, that, I flatter myself, the world will not consider this publication as unnecessary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - Page i

MISREPRESENTATION of Authors.

<i>Diodorus Siculus</i>	- - - - -	9
<i>Justin</i>	- - - - -	10
<i>Dion Cassius</i>	- - - - -	11. 82
<i>Universal History</i>	- - - - -	13
<i>Le Clerc</i>	- - - - 19. 101—104. 111—114	
<i>Josephus</i>	- - - - -	20
<i>Tertullian</i>	- - - - -	25—40
<i>Sulpicius Severus</i>	- - - - -	40
<i>Fra Paolo</i>	- - - - -	43
<i>Clemens</i>	- - - - -	44
<i>Irenæus</i>	- - - - -	46
<i>Cyprian</i>	- - - - - 47—53. 109, 110	
<i>Origen</i>	- - - - -	53—60
<i>Eusebius</i>	- - - - -	60—70
<i>Justin Martyr</i>	- - - - -	71
<i>Optatus</i>	- - - - -	73
<i>Lactantius</i>	- - - - -	75—81
<i>Epictetus</i>	- - - - -	84
<i>Marcus Antoninus</i>	- - - - -	86
<i>Pliny</i>	- - - - -	87
<i>Orosius</i>	- - - - -	88
<i>Bayle and Fabricius</i>	- - - - -	90
<i>Grotius</i>	- - - - -	91—94
<i>Mosheim</i>	- - 95—97. 104—107. 114—132	
<i>Bossuet</i>	- - - - -	98, 99
<i>Ignatius</i>	- - - - -	100, 101
<i>Dupin</i>	- - - - -	132—136

CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Tillemont</i> - - - - -	136—139
<i>Gregory of Tours</i> - - - - -	137—138
<i>Pagi</i> - - - - -	140
<i>Lord Lyttelton</i> - - - - -	140, 141
<i>Proofs of INACCURACY</i> - - - - -	141—156
<i>Additions and alterations in Mr. Gibbon's third edi-</i> <i>tion</i> - - - - -	142, 143
<i>Miscellaneous remarks</i> - - - - -	156—167

Instances of PLAGIARISM.

<i>From Middleton</i> - - - - -	169—185. 271, 272
<i>Barbeyrac</i> - - - - -	185—207
<i>Daillé</i> - - - - -	208—212
<i>Beaufobre</i> - - - - -	214—229
<i>Dodwell</i> - - - - -	229—264
<i>Lardner</i> - - - - -	265—267
<i>Abauzit</i> - - - - -	268—271
<i>Tillemont</i> - - - - -	273, 274
<i>Conclusion</i> - - - - -	276—284

E R R A T A.

Page 2. line 4. dele *bad*

- 11. note. insert *artes* before *sollerti*. Make a stop after
percepisset
- 20. line 1. for *more distant*, read *later*
- 72. note 1. 2. read διδασκαλον
- 77. l. 14. after *of*, read *our*
- 78. note. for *in bac*, read *in bac*
- 85. note 1. ult. instead of a period after πομπη. it should
be a Greek note of interrogation ;
- 90. l. 21. after *does not*, read *at all*
- 98. 19. for *spoken*, read *spoken*
- 104. note 1. 2. for *Ignatianus*, read *Ignatianus*
- 115. l. 13. read *no other* objection
- 130. note 1. 8. for *affici*, read *affici*
- 134. l. 15. for *s'etendent*, read *s'etendent*
- 143. note 1. 29. after " the motives of," insert " *his* con-
version"
- 152. note 1. 3. for *Foleti*, read *Toleti*
- 157. line 8. after *friends*, insert *of humankind*
- 163. note 1. 8. for *nor*, read *not*
- 167. note. for p. 10. read p. 101
- 188. note 1. 1. read *chap. iv*
- 200. l. 14. for *de* read *le*
- 201. note * for *sect. 15.* read *sect. 13.*
- 210. l. 22. for *quise*, read *qui se*
- 223. 1. for *tous*, read *tout*
- 243. 24. for *potuent*, read *potuerit*
- 235. 15. for *animale*, read *animal*

INTRO-

INTRODUCTION.

IT has been judiciously observed, that it is not the business of the historian to profess himself a sceptic in matters of religion.

Machiavel, whose detestable principles, in his political works, are well known, found it necessary to assume a very different character, when he wrote the History of Florence. And even David Hume, in his History of England, is content with glancing at Sacred Truth by some oblique hints.

It is therefore to be wished, that Mr. Gibbon, satisfied with the applause due to him as an elegant historian, had not produced himself as an avowed champion for infidelity, in his fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, which have cast a blemish on the whole work.

It does not appear to have been essential to his history to touch at all on "*the Rise and Progress of Christianity*," much less to make so long a digression, which seems to have been wrought up with so much art, and care, and ingenuity, that we can easily trace the author's predilection for the subject. He treats it indeed *con amore*; which has induced many judicious persons to suspect, that the rest of the volume was written to introduce these two chapters with a better grace, and more decent appearance.

However, whether the conjecture be founded on truth, or not; had our author followed his
B design,

design, as “ *a candid enquiry*,” which he professes to do *, he would have had a better right to our approbation and esteem.

The artful insinuations of so agreeable a writer, imperceptibly seduce his readers, who, charmed with his style, and deluded with the vain pomp of words, may be apt to pay too much regard to the pernicious sentiments he means to convey. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary, that they should be reminded of the unfair proceedings of such an insidious friend †, who offers the deadly draught in a golden cup, that they may be less sensible of their danger.

The remarkable mode of quotation, which Mr. Gibbon adopts, must immediately strike every one who turns to his notes. He sometimes only mentions the author, perhaps the book, and often leaves the reader the toil of finding out, or rather guessing at the passage.

The policy, however, is not without its design and use. By endeavouring to deprive us of the means of comparing him with the authorities he cites, he flattered himself, no doubt, that he might safely have recourse to misrepresentation; that his inaccuracies might escape the piercing eye of criticism; and that he might indulge his wit and spleen, in fathering the absurdest opinions on the most venerable writers of antiquity. For, often, on examining his references, when they are to be traced, we shall find him supporting his cause by

* Ch. xv. p. 449. 2d edition.

† We may, with *Virgil*, metaphorically compare the beauties of his language, to the fragrant flowers which conceal and shelter a snake;

“ Qui legitis flores, et humi nascentia fraga,

“ Eligidas, ô pueri! fugite hinc, latet anguis in herbâ.”

Bucolic. Eclog. iii. lin. 52, 93.

manifest falsification, and perpetually assuming to himself the strange privilege of inserting in his text what the writers referred to give him no right to advance on their authority.

This breach of the common faith reposed in authors, is peculiarly indefensible, as it deceives all those who have not the leisure, the means, nor the abilities, of searching out the passages in the originals.

Our author often proposes second, or even third handed notions as new; and has gained a name among some, by retailing objections which have been long ago started, and as long since refuted and exploded.

In fact, sceptics and free-thinkers are of a date so old, and their objections were urged so early, and in such numbers, that our modern pretenders to this wisdom and philosophy can with difficulty invent any thing new, or discover, with all their malevolent penetration, a fresh flaw. The same set of men have been alone distinguished by different names and appellations, from Porphyry, Celsus, or Julian, in the first ages of Christianity; down to Voltaire, Hume, or Gibbon in the present.

Such is the plan of our author. It must be mine to obviate and oppose it. In order to which, I have selected several of the more notorious instances of his misrepresentation and error, reducing them to their respective heads, and subjoining a long list of almost incredible inaccuracies, and such striking proofs of servile plagiarism, as the world will be surprised to meet with in an author who puts in so bold a claim to originality and extensive reading.

These offensive chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History have indeed met with some excellent remarks

from a learned divine* of the university of Oxford. Nor has Cambridge neglected to send forth an able champion† in defence of our common faith‡. But as both these gentlemen have confined themselves rather to confute the principles of Mr. G. than to expose the indefensible arts of supporting them, to which he has recourse, I flatter myself, the reader of the following pages will not accuse me of engaging in a controversy already exhausted.

* 'Dr. Chelfum', the author of "The Remarks on Mr. Gibbon's History of the Roman Empire."

† Dr. Watson, author of "The Apology for Christianity."

‡ Oxford seems to be particularly pointed out by a sneering sarcastical observation of Mr. Gibbon's (Note 78. c. xv.) that its "University conferred degrees on the opponents of Dr. Middleton," his favourite author. But, we should imagine, it cannot appear otherwise than a commendation, that it then expressed a just indignation against the cavils of Dr. Middleton, as it does ~~now~~ against those of his follower, Mr. Gibbon.

AN
EXAMINATION
OF THE
FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CHAPTERS
OF
Mr. GIBBON's HISTORY, &c. &c.

MR. GIBBON's own words, in the advertisement prefixed to his history, will most aptly precede the instances I mean to produce, in confirmation of the heavy charge I have brought against him. "Diligence and accuracy (says he) are the only merits which an historical writer may ascribe to himself; if any merit, indeed, can be assumed from the performance of an indispensable duty. I may, therefore, be allowed to say, that *I have carefully examined all the original materials* that could illustrate the subject which I had undertaken to treat."

Granting, then, for the present, that our author has performed what he boasts of as his merit, "That he has carefully examined all the original materials," this very circumstance will only serve

to expose him to severer animadversion. For, I trust, I shall be able to lay before my readers, proofs as flagrant as they are numerous, that if he had consulted the authors, whose authority he had appeals to, only with a view to misrepresent them, he could scarcely have deviated more from plain truth, and fair interpretation of their meaning, than he now does.

Mr. Gibbon having, as a prelude to his attack on Christianity, first introduced the Jews, it may be proper that I should begin by pointing out some of the very extraordinary liberties he has taken, in his account of that people. We are told by him, that *"the Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander. And as they multiplied to a surprizing degree in the east, and afterwards in the west, they soon excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations."* In this short extract are to be found many instances of inaccuracy, if not ignorance. In the first place, the Jews were never under the Assyrian yoke; for the kingdom of Judea survived that monarchy, and was ruined by the Babylonians. And when they were carried into captivity, they were by no means held in low esteem; but, on the contrary, seem to have been greatly regarded. The chief officers of the courts where they resided, were often chosen from among them. They were admitted as statesmen; made cup-bearers to the princes; and appointed governors of provinces*.

*. See Daniel, c. i. ver. 3. 17.—c. ii. v. 48.—c. iii. v. 30.—c. vi. v. 1. 3.

Nehemiah, c. ii. v. 1.—Ezra, c. iv. v. 19.

See also Josephus, lib. xxi. throughout, of the Antiquities of the Jews.

It is equally unjust to speak of them as slaves to the Persians: For the first king of that country gave them permission to go home; and this, in the very first year of his reign. The permit seems to have been general: so that those who stayed behind, must have been in a state of free service: Their not accepting of the leave, plainly shews it*. There is scarcely in history an instance of a conquered people being so respected; and nothing can be a greater proof of it, than their wonderful return. The Philistines, Edomites, Moabites, Hamathites, with many other ancient states in the vicinity of Judea, were about the same time subdued; and seem to have undergone a like captivity. But we do not read of any of them returning; much less of their being again constituted into a nation. And though they may not have been immediately extinct; yet their poor remains dwindled soon to nothing; while the Jews became a respectable people, and, as the author confesses, *"excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations."*

It is to be observed, that Mr. G. not only speaks of their being held in great disrepute by their conquerors; but that they were despised *for many ages*. This is strange; for their captivity was but of seventy years duration; so that upon their return, some, who had seen the former temple, were present at the dedication of the second. But the author will perhaps say, that he includes the Israelites, the ten tribes, in the account here given. But they never returned, and he must speak with great inaccuracy to call the ten tribes Jews, and to talk of their *"emerging from obscurity:"* for they were never reintated; and we have scarcely any history concerning them.

* Ezra, ch. i. ver. 3.

But the author proceeds, and assures us, that the Jews did *emerge*: and that it was "*under the successors of Alexander.*" He does not say, that it was in the time of those kings, but *under them*. By this we might be led to suppose, that this success was not owing to their own superiority and merit, nor to the divine assistance; but to the favour and indulgence of those princes. Now it is notorious, that the Jews never found any more bitter enemies, than some of these kings. Before the time of Alexander, the Jews had begun to recover themselves, and were increasing in affluence and splendour. But, upon his death, Ptolomy, the son of Lagus, his successor in Egypt, at one sweep carried off one hundred thousand of the inhabitants of Judea; of which thirty thousand were chosen persons, whom he forced to serve in his armies. The residue he gave up for slaves to his soldiers. He demolished the walls of Jerusalem, and transplanted many of the people to Egypt, and others were obliged to settle in the regions of Barca and Cyrene*. Nothing could be more critical to a growing state, than these misfortunes. But they were not to be compared to the cruelties of Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, the tyrant of Syria. He defiled their temple, and persecuted them for their religion in a shocking manner; putting numbers of them, on that account, to death. In short, he was very *intolerant*; and the inveteracy of the Greeks in general was such, as that nothing but the divine protection could have saved the Jews from ruin; for their utter extirpation was aimed

* See Josephus, Antiq. lib. xii. c. 1 — Contra Apion, lib. 1. Eusebii Chron. — Appiani Syriaca. — Aristas de Ixx Interp. Usher's Chronol. p. 221. — Prideaux's Connection, vol. ii.

at*. Such was the mild influence under which Mr. G. supposes the Jews to have flourished; absurdly placing to their advantage, what tended to their ruin. Let us now turn our eyes back, and reconsider the account given by our author about the Jews being in *servitude* under the *Affyrians*, and under the *Persians*: and how they languished for *many ages*; and were the *most despised portion of all their slaves*: that they were of little consequence in former times; but *emerged* from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander: when they were dispersed to the *east*, and to the *west*; and *soon* became the wonder of the world. What a strange assemblage is here? It is like Milton's chaos, "*without bound, without dimension: where time and place are lost.*" In short, what does this display afford us, but a deal of boyish colouring, to the prejudice of much good history.

The author will perhaps tell us, that he has the authority of Tacitus for all that he alleges. But the misfortune is, that Tacitus was very little acquainted with the ancient state of the Jews; and, setting this aside, there is nothing in the quotation, which comes up to the author's purpose. He totally mistakes the meaning of it, when he alludes to the Jewish captivity, and speaks of the people, as the most despicable of *Slaves*. I cannot find any thing of this purport in the Roman historian. He seems to have known nothing of the captivity; nor does he mention any state of slavery. There is, moreover, a mistake in Mr. G's quotation; for, according to him, the passage is—"despectissima *" pars servitutis;*" (the most despised part of their

* See Diodori Ecloga, lib. xl. p. 921.

Joseph. Antiq. lib. xii. p. 611.

Taciti H. R. lib. v. c. 8.

slavery) but in the original we find it “despectissima pars *servientium* :”—of their foreign subjects.

This mistake, I am confident, was not designed; and must therefore be imputed to a slip in memory: but it is, however, of consequence; for the terms *serviens* and *servire* do not necessarily denote slavery. They may be applied to any people, who have been conquered, and rendered tributary and dependant*. Many nations have been reduced to a state of subservience and even vassalage: and yet have never been deemed slaves. The purport of the account given by the Roman historian, is this. He has been speaking of the chief city of the Jews, and of their sumptuous temple, and polity: and he supposes, that they began to make a figure soon after the time of Alexander the Great. He mentions their grandeur, the rise of which he dates from that æra; but, excepting some few vague traditions, he seems quite ignorant of every circumstance that has preceded. His words are as follow: “† A great part of Judea is scattered in

* Dion Cassius speaking of Phraates says, Ὀυτος δὲ Ἀραβίαν μὲν τῶν νῦν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ μὲντοι τῆς εὐθεῖας θαλάσσης βασιλεὺς. Lib. xxxvii. p. 20. Edit. R. Steph. “He, Phraates, reigned over the Arabians, who at that time were subject to the Romans, as far as the Red Sea.”

The Author does not mean, by the term ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ, “they were subject, or subservient to,” that the Arabians were really slaves, but only that they were tributary.

† “Magna pars Judææ vicis dispergitur: habent et oppida. Hierosolyma gentis caput. Illic immensæ opulentiaæ templum: et primis ‡ munimentis urbs: dein regia. Templum intimis clausum: ad fores tantum Judææ aditus: limine præter sacerdotes arcebantur. Dum Assyrios penes Medosque et Persas oriens fuit, despectissima pars *servientium*. Postquam Macedones præpotuere, rex Antiochus demere superstitionem & mores Græcorum dare annixus, quo minus teterrimam gentem in melius mutaret, Parthorum bello prohibitus est.” Hist. lib. v. cap. 9.

‡ Would not the passage read better, if instead of *primis*, we read *firmis*?

“villages:

" villages : they have also towns or cities : Jeru-
 " salem is the metropolis. They have a temple
 " there immensely rich, and the city is strongly
 " fortified, as is also the palace. The temple
 " is shut up within ; the Jews have access only
 " to the doors ; none but the priests pass over the
 " threshold. Whilst the East was under the do-
 " minion of the Assyrians, and the Medes and
 " Persians, they were the most despised part of
 " their subjects. After that the Macedonians
 " gained the superiority, King Antiochus en-
 " deavouring to destroy their superstition, and to
 " infuse into them the manners of Greece, in or-
 " der to transform and amend a barbarous race,
 " was impeded in his designs by the Parthian
 " war."

In the account here given, the historian is not speaking of the Jews being carried into captivity, nor of any state of slavery ; for, as I said before, he was totally unacquainted with it. He is speaking of Judea being a province to the eastern monarchs, and, he says, that the people were the meanest of all that were tributary. His reason for saying so was, because he had never heard of them antecedent to this æra ; and he, therefore, makes his ignorance an argument for their obscurity.

It is to be observed, that Tacitus seems to have had as great a prejudice against the Jews, as Mr. Gibbon has ; and it is therefore no wonder, that the latter so often applies to his authority. It should, however, have been considered by Mr. Gibbon, that whoever adopts another's evidence, at the same time makes himself accessory to his mistakes and absurdities. Of these, I think some traces may be found in the following quotation about the same people. Tacitus has been speaking of Antiochus being called off by the revolt of the Par-
 thians

thians under Arsaces; and then adds *, * At that time the Macedonians being weak in power, the Parthians not yet arrived at their strength, and the Roman authority at a great distance, the Jews elected their own kings." It is well known, that Tacitus was fond of refinement, and would fain find out the spring of action in every great event. Hence, instead of being conducted by the sage and steady historian, we are often misled by the subtilty of the politician, till we are quite bewildered. Thus, in the extract above, having mentioned that the Jewish nation grew great, and erected themselves into a kingdom, he would likewise give us the reasons for this rise and alteration. But he founds it all upon negative principles; and, instead of shewing what was the cause, he tells us, what was not the impediment, which is surely a strange way of proceeding. It arose, we should imagine, from their being populous and powerful; and, at the same time, from the intrigues and ambition of particulars, who were desirous of a change in the government. No, says our historian; the reason of their admitting royalty was, because *the Macedonians were weak, the Parthians immature, and the Romans at a great distance*. He might have also inserted, because they were not ruined by a famine, nor destroyed by a pestilence, nor overwhelmed by a deluge. Their first king was Aristobulus (A. U. C. 649.) between whom and their return from captivity, was an interval of above 420 years. Hence they might have had a king, if they had chosen it, before the Macedonian, or the Parthian, was at all known; nay, before the name of the Roman had well reached to the foot of Italy.

* " Tum Judæi Macedonibus invalidis, Parthis nondum adultis, & Romani procul aberant, sibi ipsi reges imposuere."

It is remarkable, that not one of the authors referred to by Mr. Gibbon *, in confirmation of his account of the Jews, mentions " their *emerging from obscurity*;" much less do they specify the particular period fixed on by our author, " *under the successors of Alexander*." To what has been already shewn, I shall add the words of Diodorus Siculus.

" † Under the Persian and Macedonian government, from their intermixing with the Heathen World, many of the ancient laws and institutions of the Jews were *changed*," as having become obsolete:

This change seems to imply a prior establishment; and that *the Jews* " *did not emerge from obscurity*" under the Persian or Macedonian empire, but had long before enjoyed the free prerogatives of their laws and liberties. The words of the historian will admit of no other construction; for, what he had before said, absolutely contradicts Mr. Gibbon's assertion.

" After speaking of the Jews coming from Egypt under the guidance of Moses, and extolling his prudence as a legislator, and for training them up to labour and martial discipline:" he continues thus, " † He (Moses) waged war also with the neighbouring nations; and having gained large tracts of land, divided it among the people for an inheritance." And

* Note 2. chap. xv.

† Diodorus Siculus, lib. xl. p. 544. Wesseling. Ed. Κατὰ δὲ τὰς ὕστερον γινόμενας ἐπικρατίας ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἐπιμείας, ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς τῶν Περσῶν ἡγεμονίας, καὶ τῶν ταύτην καταλυσάντων Μανιδίων, πολλὰ τῶν πατρῶν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων ἐκινήθη.

‡ ἐποίητο δὲ καὶ στρατίας εἰς τὰ ἀλλοφύλων τῶν ἰδιῶν καὶ πολλῇ κατακτησάμενος χώραν, κατεκλήρουσθε.

again

again he says, "† The Jewish nation was ever very
" populous."

It is not easy to say how this account can be made to coincide, even by the skilful Mr. G. with his representation, that "*they were the most
" despised portion of slaves,*" and just "*emerged
" from obscurity.*" How could people in such a weak and despicable condition; invade the territories of their powerful neighbours, vanquish their forces, and take possession of their country?

Our author found, that Diodorus made mention of the Jews, and one would suppose, that he therefore deemed it necessary to *cite* such learned authority, without regarding how widely he differed from him in the relation of the facts, and of important points in their history.

Neither does *Justin*, another writer appealed to by Mr. Gibbon, authorise this his assertion. He says, that " * Xerxes first subdued the Jews: afterwards, with the Persian nation, they were subjected to the Macedonian empire under Alexander the Great, and were for a long time subservient to it. On revolting from Demetrius, and seeking an alliance with the Romans, they were restored to their liberty, the first of all the eastern nations."

This can hardly be said to agree with our author's sentiments. For, if Xerxes first made them tributary, they were previously free. Nor are

† αἱ τὸ γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπῆρχε πολυάνθρωπον.

* Justinus, l. xxxvi. c. 2, 3. (8vo. edit. Lugd. Batav. 1650.)

" Primum Xerxes rex Persarum, Judæos domuit: postea cum ip[s]is Persis in ditionem Alexandri Magni venerē, diuque in potestatem Macedonici imperii subiecti Syriæ regno fuere. . A
" Demetrio cum descivissent, amicitia Romanorum petita, primum omnium ex orientalibus libertatem receperunt, facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus."

they

they described as a despicable set of slaves; on the contrary, we find them the very first whom the Romans thought worthy to receive their liberties.

After all, were we even to admit, that Mr. Gibbon had asserted nothing concerning the Jews, but what he had really found in Justin, Diodorus, and Tacitus, would he not deservedly incur our censure, for calling in the testimony of witnesses whom he himself must know to be shamefully ignorant of the facts in question * ?

Another part of Mr. Gibbon's account of the Jews, though given to us on the authority of Dion Cassius, is not really to be met with in that historian. Our author's words are these: " From the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius, the Jews discovered a fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome, which repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections †."

To confirm this, he relates the dreadful accounts of those at Cyrene and Cyprus ‡; and appeals to Dion §.

Now, although the reference to Dion in Reimar's edition, leads us to the dismal relation of

* For instance, Justin says, that " the Jews were exiled from Egypt as contagious—that Joseph used magic arts—that it was the custom of the nation to consecrate the seventh day, called the Sabbath, by a *fast*—That, through veneration for their leader, Moses, they in all ages united the regal and sacerdotal offices in one person."

† Chap. xvi. p. 521.

‡ Chap. xvi. note 1.

§ L. lxviii. p. 1145.

" ¶ Cum magicas ibi follehti ingenio percipisset septimum diem more gentis Sabbathum appellatum jejuniis sacravit—semperque exinde hic mos apud Judæos fuit, in omne ævum; ut eosdem reges ac sacerdotes habuerunt.
Diodorus Siculus adopts nearly the same erroneous opinions.

these

these horrid barbarities perpetrated under the reign of Trajan, which our author has circumstantially described, yet Dion gives no testimony to the preceding assertion, that “ their fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections,” as these were which he had just related; *nor does he accuse them of being guilty of such*, during the long period of time which elapsed from “ the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius.” But, on the contrary, there is no mention made by Dion of the Jews under Nero, Galba, or Otho. Under the reign of Vitellius, it is briefly said, that Vespasian “ carried on a war against the Jews*.” In that of Vespasian, Dion slightly speaks of Josephus †, and of the taking of Jerusalem ‡?

We read no further account of them under Titus, Domitian, nor Nerva. During the reign of Trajan, the massacre at Cyrene and Cyprus are mentioned by him; and he speaks of the emperor Hadrian’s being engaged in a war with them on founding the colony of Ælia Capitolina.

We see that it does not appear from Dion, but that the Jews lived in quiet submission, *without impatiently breaking forth in repeated insurrections and furious massacres*; during the reigns of several emperors between Nero and Antoninus. If their impatience of the dominion of Rome had thus broken through every restraint, and gratified its rage with the blood of their enemies, the pen of

* Dion’s words are, καὶ ὁ Ὀκτωπσιανὸς Ἰουδαίους πολέμῳ. P. 1065. lib. lxx. Reimar. Ed.

† L. lxxvi. p. 1077. Reim.

‡ ὁ δὲ Τίτος, τῷ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους πολέμῳ ἐπιταχθεὶς, τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶλε, καὶ τοὺς ναοὺς ἐπέπρησε. Τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις οὐχ ὅτι ὀλεθροῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ νίκης καὶ σωτηρίας ἰουδαϊκῶς τε εἶναι ἰδοῦναι, ὅτι τῷ ἱερὶ συναπαλάττω. P. 217. Steph. Ed. Xiphilin. Epitom.

the historian could not have passed it over in silence.

So that, though Mr. G. could establish the truth of this part of his history from other authority; yet, as he has appealed to Dion alone, who does not give him reason for his assertion, he merits our censure.

Our author, in treating of the Jewish oeconomy and ceremonies, has, in a particular passage, not only made use of a fallible argument, but misrepresented and manifestly perverted the authority he quotes. The sentence is this,

“ If a strict obedience had been paid to the order, that every male, three times in the year, should present himself before the Lord Jehovah, it would have been impossible that the Jews could ever have spread themselves beyond the narrow limits of the promised land *.”

The authority, to which Mr. G. directs † us, as corroborating the sentiment, is that of the Universal History ‡;—where we are to find “ a sensible note †” on the subject. Such indeed it is; but it happens, somewhat unluckily, that this sensible note supports an hypothesis directly opposite to that of Mr. Gibbon. So far is it from *denying the possibility* “ of paying a strict obedience to the order,” or insinuating a *neglect* of it; that, on the contrary, it endeavours to remove the grand objections that have been raised against it §.

But

* Page 453. c. xv.

† Note 11, c. xv.

‡ “ Universal History, vol. i. p. 603.” N. B. p. 603 is in vol. ii. fol. Lond. 1736.

§ The two grand objections are, 1st. “ If they assembled, from every part, at Jerusalem at once, how that city could contain such prodigious multitudes? and, 2dly. How they could leave their cities defenceless?” In answer to the first,

But what shall we say, if, indeed, no such order was ever given? Mr. G. in asserting that there was, may perhaps be thought more excusable, as several men of learning agree with him here. But much may be urged to prove, that they are in a mistake. The matter stands thus. It is said in Exodus, *Three times in the year shall all your men-children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel* *. The like occurs in Deuteronomy. *Three times in the year shall all the males appear before the Lord thy God: in the place which he shall choose:—and they shall not appear before the Lord empty* †. The objection made to this is to shew the absurdity of such an ordi-

the note (O) observes, that “the Talmud exempts from this obligation, 1. The women, who were to take care of their families. 2. Boys under twelve years of age. 3. All old men above sixty. 4. All the sick and impotent, lunatics, &c.”

Though by these exceptions the numbers must be greatly diminished, yet the note adds also an exception which must crush Mr. G.’s objection. “And, lastly, all that either lived at such a distance from the tabernacle, and afterwards from the temple, that they could not perform the journey on foot.” Besides this, “Calculation is here made of the capaciousness of Jerusalem; and the probability of their dwelling in tents round about it is urged.”—It is noted also, “that they did not all appear together on the same day; but took it by turns, and stayed in the city but one night; and on the next morning, having performed their devotions, returned, and made way for others.”

The latter objection is answered by shewing, that “half of the males stayed at home to guard their houses, children, wives, lands, &c. whilst the other half went up:” and furthermore, that “some went one month, and the others the next.”

Is it not strange that Mr. G. should corroborate his assertion, by appealing to an authority that contradicts it? What judgment must be formed of this proceeding? Shall we say he has not consulted the Universal History? Or that he has been guilty of gross misrepresentation, by producing this testimony to confirm his proposition, which it aims to refute?

* Chap. xxxiv. ver. 23.

† Chap. xvi. ver. 16, 17.

stance; and the impracticability of its being carried into execution. It is particularly urged, that those, who lived at a great distance, could not go up so often to Jerusalem; and if they did go up, it was still impossible for the city to hold them. Besides, they must leave their lands for too long a time neglected; and their borders would be exposed to the inroads of any enemy, that would take advantage of their absence. To obviate these objections, many well-meaning persons have considered the extent of Jerusalem, and calculated how many it could hold. They have also made an estimate of the number of tents, which might be pitched without the walls, and of other accommodations, which might be procured. They mention, that all did not come up upon the same day; and their lands, therefore, need not be supposed to have been entirely neglected. The Authors of the Universal History, as we see in the foregoing note, have recourse to the Talmud, to shew, that children, sick persons, lunatics, and old men were excused. But these expedients are as unnecessary, as the objections are idle: These learned men have been labouring to find out a remedy, where there is no disorder; for the passage is totally misunderstood. What we find in our translation rendered *thrice*, and three times; is, in the original, *שלוש פעמים בשנה*, *tribus vicibus anni*—*at three of the changes, or seasons of the year*, every male was to present himself before the Lord. By this was not meant, that they should go up to Shiloh, or to the temple, all these three times; but only at one of the three. For three different seasons were appointed for the convenience of those who were to make their appearance. Instead of applying to the Talmud, and the Jewish rabbies, the best way to interpret the scriptures is by the scriptures; and that people went up only at one of these three times, may be seen from various passages. It is

said of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, that he went up out of his city YEARLY to worship, and to sacrifice to the Lord God of hosts in Shiloh*. And it is repeated, that the man Elkanah, and all his house, went up to offer unto the Lord the YEARLY sacrifice, and his vow†. Concerning every firstling of the flock, and of the herd, it was thus enacted:—*Thou shalt eat it before the Lord thy God, YEAR BY YEAR, in the place which the Lord shall choose ‡.* We find, that once only in every year they were to make this offering. Hence it is said by the prophet Zechariah, *Every one that is left, &c. &c. shall go up from year to year to worship §.* In conformity to this we find, that the parents of our Saviour went up to Jerusalem every year: and we are told, that it was at the feast of the passover ||: For this feast was more particularly observed. From these instances we may, I think, be assured, that it was once only in the year when this presentation was enjoined: at which time none were to appear before the Lord empty. At one of these seasons they brought all the offerings commanded by the law, and presented them before the Lord. *Three times in the year (or at the three particular changes and divisions of the year) shall all the males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose: in the feast of unleavened bread; and in the feast of weeks; and in the feast of tabernacles; and they shall not appear before the Lord empty. Every man shall give as he is able; according to the blessing of the Lord thy God, which he hath given thee**.* Among the presents then made were the first fruits, and the firstlings of their flocks and herds. *Thou shalt do no work with the firstlings of thy bullock, nor shear the firstling of the sheep. Thou*

* Samuel, c. i. v. 3.

§ Zech. c. xiv. v. 16.

† C. ii. v. 21.

|| Luke, c. ii. v. 41.

‡ D. ut. c. xv. v. 20.

** Deut. c. xvi. v. 16, 17.

shalt eat it before the Lord YEAR BY YEAR *in the place, which the Lord shall choose, thou and thy household* *. But it may be said, that this is still a precept full of danger; for after all there must be a time, when one third of the people would necessarily be drafted away; and some of the provinces be bereft of their proper defence. It must likewise be inconvenient, and hardly practicable, for people at the extremities of the country to drive their cattle, and carry their other offerings to Jerusalem. And, lastly, there must have been many other impediments; such as arose from remoteness, sickness, badness of the roads, inclemency of the weather, which rendered the ordinance impolitic, as well as impracticable. These three objections are answered to our hands by the sacred writer. In respect to the injunction being injudicious, from the lands being left defenceless; it is observable that, when God appoints the yearly presentation to be made, he is pleased to promise the divine interposition and security. *For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice (it is, in the original, at the three changes: in the seventy תשע וארבע) of the year* †. In respect to the second objection, about conveying their cattle and other offerings, we find, in the same place where the duty is enjoined, an occasional remedy provided.—*But if the way be too long for thee, or that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee, which the Lord thy God shall choose, &c. then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine band, and shalt go up unto the place which the Lord thy God*

* Deut. c. xv. v. 19.

† Exodus, c. xxxiv. v. 24.

shalt choose *. This, I think, affords a sufficient answer to the second cavil. As to the other difficulties, which might arise from poverty, or sickness, and distance from the capital; there was also an allowance made for such cases. Many of the people resided, according to their lot, beyond Jordan; some lived near Beersheba; and others as far as Dan, and the entrance of Hamath. To many of these it must certainly have been very inconvenient, and, perhaps, impracticable, to take this annual journey. There must, likewise, among the children of Israel, as among all other nations, have been some persons in no degree of affluence. There were, undoubtedly, thousands in many of the tribes, who had their petty offerings to make, to whom, however, it would have been almost ruin to have taken such an expensive journey. All this is very true: and it was accordingly foreseen by the allwise and merciful framer of these laws. The same God who appointed the ordinance, admitted likewise of a dispensation. All reasonable excuse was allowed; and the affair seems to have been left to their own consciences. It is, therefore, farther said:—*When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he hath promised thee, &c.—if the place, which the Lord thy God hath chosen, to put his name there, be too far for thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herd, and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee: and thou shalt eat in thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after* †. That is, thou shalt eat it without offering it, or making any sacrifice; for all sacrifices, and all vows, were indispensably to be performed at Jerusalem. *Take heed that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest; but in the place, which the*

* Deut. c. xii. v. 20.

† Chap. xii. v. 21.

Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes: There thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings; and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.—Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thine oil, or the firstlings of thy herds, or of thy flock, &c. &c. But thou must eat them before the Lord thy God, in the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose.* Then comes the dispensation above-mentioned †, that if the place were too far from them, they might remain at home; and without making any offering, enjoy the blessings bestowed upon them within their own precincts. *Thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock,—as I have commanded thee; and thou shalt eat it within thy gates.* We see here an indemnity granted to those who could not, without great inconvenience, go up; and we may suppose, that thousands in every tribe availed themselves of it.

We have not, as yet, done with our author's misrepresentations relative to the Jews. He tells us ‡, “During the long period which elapsed between the Egyptian and Babylonian servitudes, the hopes as well as fears of the Jews appear to have been confined within the narrow compass of the present life.”

In support of this he appeals to Le Clerc §.

Now it is remarkable, that so far is this author from confirming the representation given by Mr. Gibbon, that he says not a word respecting the sentiments of the Jews on this subject, at the place to which our historian refers us. He tells us || indeed that the Pharisees really believed in a resurrection, and such a one as the gospel taught; but this

* Deut. c. xii. v. 13, 14, and 17, 18.

† Ver. 21.

‡ Page 459.

§ Note 57. c. xv. Prolegom. ad Hist. Ecclesiast. c. i. § 8.

|| C. ii. § 8.

relates to a much more distant period. This being the case, what opinion can the reader have of Mr. Gibbon's fidelity in appealing to this authority?

One more instance of our author's accuracy on the subject of the Jews appears in the following passage: "After Cyrus had permitted the exile nation to return into the promised land; and after Ezra had restored the ancient records of their religion, two celebrated sects, the Pharisees and Sadduces, insensibly arose at Jerusalem."

In confirmation of the above, Josephus* is the authority appealed to. But we may again observe, that our author builds without a foundation. For Josephus, as here referred to, says nothing of the rise of the Pharisees; but only speaks of their peculiar tenets.

On reading Mr. G.'s references to the testimony of *heathen* writers, cited by him in order to oppose and contradict the Jewish and scriptural history, I could not help reflecting on an admirable passage of bishop Warburton on this subject; which the reader will thank me for introducing here, as being equally applicable to Mr. G. as to his predecessors in infidelity, and serving to shew that he only treads over again the same beaten path.

"† This is ill enough," says the bishop, "but the perversity I speak of is infinitely worse: And that is, when the same writer, on different occasions, assumes the dogmatist and sceptic on the very same question, and so abuses both characters, by the most perverse self-contradiction.

"For instance, how common is it for one of your writers, when he brings *Pagan* antiquity to

* Joseph. Antiquit. Jud. lib. xiii. c. 10.

† See the dedication prefixed to the *Divine Legation of Moses*, p. 39. vol. i. 8vo edit.

"contradict

“ contradict and discredit the *Jewish*, to cry up a
 “ Greek historian as an evidence, to which nothing
 “ can be replied? An imperfect hint from *Herodotus*, or *Diodorus*, though one lived a thousand,
 “ and the other fifteen hundred years, after the
 “ point in question, picked up from any lying va-
 “ gabond they met in their travels, shall now out-
 “ weigh the circumstantial history of *Moses*; who
 “ wrote of his own people, and lived in the times
 “ he wrote of.

“ But now turn the tables, and apply the testi-
 “ mony of those writers, and of others of the best
 “ credit of the same nation, to the confirmation of
 “ *Jewish history*, and then nothing is more uncer-
 “ tain and fallacious, than ancient writings. All
 “ antiquity is darkness and confusion: Then we
 “ hear of

————— “ *Quicquid Græcia mendax*
 “ *Audet in historia.*

“ Then *Herodotus* is a lying traveller, and *Dio-*
 “ *dorus Siculus* a hasty collector.

“ Again, when the choice and separation of the
 “ *Israelites*, for God’s peculiar people, is to be
 “ brought in doubt, and rendered ridiculous, then
 “ are they represented as the vilest, most pro-
 “ fligate, and perverse race of men: Then every
 “ indiscreet passage of a *declamatory divine* is raked
 “ up with care to make them odious; and even
 “ the hard fate of the great historian *Josephus*
 “ pitied, that he had *no better a subject than such*
 “ *an illiterate, barbarous, and ridiculous people* *.

“ But when the scripture account of the treat-
 “ ment, which the Holy *Jesus* met with from
 “ them, is thought fit to be disputed, these *Jews*

* Discourse of Free-thinking, p. 157.

“ are become an humane and wise nation ; that,
 “ interfered not with the teachings of sects, or the
 “ propagation of opinions, but where the public
 “ safety was thought to be in danger by seditious
 “ doctrines,” &c. &c.

We have seen, at some length, how little foundation Mr. G. had for appealing to the several authors, whose names figure in his notes, in support of his gross misrepresentations concerning the Jews. Let us now pass on to a review of his treatment of the first defenders of Christianity.

After attacking that revelation on which the gospel is founded, his next part was to encounter these champions of the gospel faith. The transition was easy, and natural enough.

The peculiar acrimony with which our author so frequently censures the fathers, having roused my indignation, led me to examine what reasons he had for such harsh language. And, upon examination, I found them to be either entirely groundless, or, where there was some ground for them, to be cruelly and unjustifiably exaggerated.

The views of Mr. G. are manifest ; he wishes *per fas aut nefas* to lessen the authority of the fathers, and diminish the respect and reverence justly due to them ; hoping, thereby, to aim an effectual blow at the religion, of which their testimony ever has been justly considered as a strong support. The vindication of them, therefore, is a cause in which I willingly engage ; because it will appear to be equally the cause of truth, as it is that of Christianity. Still let it be remembered, that I do not undertake an *indiscriminate* defence of *all* the fathers ; nor even of the *whole* works of any one of them. Whoever reads them must, amidst all his commendations, find something to blame.

Nor shall Mr. G. go beyond me in expressing a disapprobation of their far-fetched allegories, and of their indefensible austerities.

I shall here beg leave to introduce the following passage from Dr. Gregory Sharpe *, as expressive of my own sentiments.

“ Some men had lifted up the authority of the fathers higher than could be justified: They were not content to make saints of them, but their opinions must be decisive in all matters of faith and religious controversy.

“ From one extreme are the fathers fallen to the other, from having been almost Gods, they are become lower than the children of men. The great reverence the Christian world once had for them, may have proceeded from the excellence of their characters, and a frequent reading their productions; for it is hard to read them, and not to be prejudiced in their favour: And that this esteem is now gone, may be owing to a neglect of their writings: And perhaps they who have been most free in their censures of them, have been least conversant in their works. Men who knew nothing more of them, than that they were Christians, strangers to their very names as well as to their real characters and writings, are most ready to pursue and join the cry against them, as if they had been the very worst, or the very weakest of men.—But for the sake of justice and honour, let us not condemn men without knowing what can be said for them; nor for the sake of common sense, as well as common ho-

* Sharpe's "Apology for some of the first Christians," added to his "Arguments in defence of Christianity," p. 88, 89, 8vo. edit.

“ nesty, condemn them without knowing what it is they have done.

“ From such voluminous writings, many strange things may and have been produced, but this is not peculiar to the Christian fathers; and if men, or books are to be judged of only by their faults, who shall be saved. It would be thought very partial, and very unjust, to glean from Diodorus, Herodotus, Livy, Pliny, Plutarch, and other good and antient pagan writers, the rubbish of all sorts that may be found in their writings, by a man who has the dirty disposition to look after such filth, and impose his medley of faults upon the world for a specimen of the veracity and approved abilities of those authors. But this has been done over and over again with the fathers; so that their latest enemies are not entitled so much as to the merit of discoverers; nor have they added much to the old heap, though they have much to clamour and abuse*.”

Tertullian, amongst the fathers, stands in a peculiar point of view. In his maturest compositions, warmth of temper betrayed him into indiscretions of sentiment and expression, perhaps not strictly defensible; and it is well known, that he at last adopted the most extravagant notions of childish

* The learned Cave has ingeniously pointed out the proper use of the Fathers.

“ Veneramus patres non tanquam fidei *judices*, sed *testes*, qui quid quovis sæculo gestum creditumvé sit nobis fideliter exponunt, sacrum fidei depositum ad nos transmittunt; quæ hereses, et quando oriæ, hunc vel illum fidei articulum oppugnârunt, perspicuè docent. Et quò vetustiores hi testes sunt, eò validius ferunt testimonium, et nos majori nitimur certitudine.” See his “*Epistola Apologetica*”—p. 18, 19.—The reader may here also find an account of the ill-treatment which the Fathers have met with, and the probable causes of it assigned.

enthusiasm,

enthusiasm. No wonder, therefore, that Mr. G. so frequently produces "the stern Tertullian"—"the zealous African," as an object of his sneering abuse. But I shall shew that the impartial historian has unfairly distorted his character.

Misrepresentations of TERTULLIAN.

I.

From the first instance I shall give, one would think Mr. G. was little acquainted with the writings of this father. For he says *, "Tertullian" "has written a severe treatise against idolatry, to caution his brethren against the hourly danger of incurring that guilt." "*Recogita sylvam, et quantæ latitant spinæ.*" c. 10.

These words, I should imagine, we ought to find in ch. 10. of this *his severe treatise* against idolatry. Yet our author's reference to c. 10. does not direct us to the sentence. Neither do I remember reading it in the whole treatise. When therefore he tells us, "*he has carefully examined all the original materials,*" are we to believe him? or is it his design to try how far the credulity and easy disposition of the age will suffer him to proceed unsuspected and undiscovered?

This is not the sole umbrage which the above treatise gives Mr. G. he resumes the attack in these words,

II.

"If a pagan friend (on the occasion perhaps of sneezing) used the familiar expression of *Jupiter*

* Note 39. c. xv.

"*blefs*

" *bliss you, the Christian was obliged to protest*
 " *against the divinity of Jupiter **"

Our author here throws aside the mask, and discovers the design of his writing these two last chapters; namely, to make religion appear in the garb of ridiculous superstition†. It is to be wished, that this mode of writing were not suited to the taste of the present times. However, I have the happiness to say, that it is a *groundless sneer*.

Before I enter on the proof, I beg leave to ask Mr. G. if Tertullian gives him authority to write *idolatria* for *idololatria*. This very ridiculous blunder, were he not so learned a man, and so "*careful to examine the original materials*," one would be apt to impute to inaccuracy, or neglect of the press, if it had not uniformly preserved its place through the three editions of his history. But to proceed; We find what was allowed be-

* Note. 47. c. xv.

† I may here aptly subjoin the sentiment of the learned Dr. Maclaine, on this part of Mr. Gibbon's history.

" I had been reading the account given by Mr. Edward Gibbon, of the progress of the Christian religion; in which the gravest subject, and one of the gravest kinds of writing, are both dishonoured by a *perpetual* and *unnecessary* sneer. I say an *unnecessary* sneer, because Mr. Gibbon lives in a country where a man may write and speak as he thinks, without danger or molestation. He was therefore under no necessity of aping the manner of some of the French philosophers (as they are pleased to call themselves), who cover their infidelity with a sedate and well disguised irony, to escape the secular arm of religious persecution. It is true a sneer may have its place and time; but surely its *place* cannot be historical narrative, through which, at least, it never ought to reign; nor is it a *time* to sneer, when Christianity is the subject of discussion, because this religion has a professed relation to the most solemn and important interests, and has, in effect, been a source of consolation and hope to the wisest of mankind in all ages."

fore

fore* to be a *caution* in this treatise on idolatry, now magnified into an *obligation*. Yet the stern Tertullian has acted the contrary part, and diminished the restraint,

For, he says, after putting them on their guard with respect to the use of their words :

“ The law forbids that the Gods of the nations should be named, not indeed that we may not utter their names, which, as I may say, conversation extorts from us. But if there must be mention made of the Gods, something should be added, by which it might appear, that I do not speak of them as Gods †.” This passage, no doubt, is what Mr. G. hints at ; but it does not seem so unreasonable as to merit a sneer ; especially if we consider what he had premised. “ † We should be cautious,” says he, “ lest we suffer idolatry to intermix in our discourse, either through custom, or fear.”

He excuses then the customary fault in *conversation*, (which Mr. G. seems to urge) and gives several instances of it when inoffensive ; excepting one only, and even that conditionally, and proceeding from the Christian himself §. On the other hand, when this acquiescence arose from timidity, he

* Note 39. c. xv.

† C. 20. “ Deos nationum nominari lex prohibet : non utique ne nomina eorum pronuntiemus, quæ nobis ut dicamus conversatio extorquet. Quod si Deos dicendum erit, adjiciendum est aliquid, quo adpareat, quia non ego illos Deos dico.”

‡ “ Sed enim cum conversatio divinæ disciplinæ non factis tantum veram etiam verbis periclitetur—meminisse debemus esse in verbis quoque idololatriæ incursum præcavendum, aut de consuetudinis vitio, aut timiditatis.”

§ “ Ceterum consuetudinis vitium est me Hercule dicere, mendacem scdm, accedente ignorantia quorundam qui ignorant jurandum esse per Herculem.”

rank8

ranks it as inexcusable, and explains when it might be said to proceed from this cause *.

"† A Christian likewise," says he, "will not suffer himself to be *blest* by the Gods of the heathen; for this is to be cursed by God. If I should *give alms* to any one, or do him some other good action, and he should intreat his Gods to be propitious to me: in that case, my gift or action redounds to the honour of the idols, through whom he recompences my favour with a blessing."——

We now see that we have not, through the whole quotation, the particular instance of *sneezing* which Mr. G. is pleased to give as a matter to be laughed at; and I hope the wide difference between the words of Tertullian, and those of our author, will not pass unnoticed by the ingenuous reader. The one speaks with a seriousness and benevolence highly becoming a sincere Christian; the other, with that air of ridicule and detraction, in which the Sceptic usually treats such matters. But, as our author has not sufficient reason for his sarcastical remark, shall he with impunity be suffered to make it? Nay, even pitiful as it is, he cannot call it his own. I trust I shall be able to direct my reader, before I conclude, to a modern writer

* "Timiditatis est autem, cum te alius per deos suos obligat juratione, vel aliqua testificatione, et tu, ne intelligaris, quiescis: nam æque quiescendo confirmas majestatem eorum, cujus causa videberis obligatus. Quid refert Deos nationum dicendo Deos, an audiendo, confirmes? jures per idola, an ab alio adjuratus, adquiescas?"

† C. 22. "Æque benedicti per Deos nationum, Christo initiatus non sustinebit, ut semper rejiciat immundam benedictionem, et eam sibi in Deum convertens emundet. Benedicti per Deos nationum, maledicti est per Deum. Si cui *dedero elemosynam, vel aliquid præstitero beneficii*, oblatio mea vel operatio idolorum honor erit, per quam benedictionis gratiam compensat."

from

from whom he has borrowed this and many other abusive sneers.

III.

As a third instance, I shall here shew how Mr. G. mutilates and mistranslates a passage, which he produces, to bring in this father guilty of passing an unjust sentence of "condemnation on the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans *."

I have translated the material part inserted in our author's history, as literally as the different idioms of the two languages, and the author's mode of writing will permit †. The whole passage in the original is transcribed in the note, that the learned may see what foundation I have for my charge.

‡ TERTULLIAN—*On Public Shows.*

<p>C. 30. "But what a spectacle is now at hand, the Advent of the Lord, now undoubted, now glorious, now triumphant? What exultation of angels, what</p>	<p>Mr. GIBBON's translation. (p. 474.) "You are fond of spectacles," exclaims the stern Tertullian, "expect the greatest</p>
--	--

* Note 70. c. xv. Tertullian de spectaculis, c. 30.

† The words which our author has omitted in his translation are marked out by a different character. I have placed my translation in a column opposite to Mr. Gibbon's, that his partiality and unfairness may be more manifest.

‡ Tertullianus de spectaculis, c. xxx. edit. Rigalt.

"Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est, adventus Domini, jam indubitati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis? quæ illa exultatio angelorum, quæ gloria resurgentium sanctorum? quale regnum exinde iustorum? qualis civitas nova Hierusalem? At enim supersunt alia spectacula, ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies, ille nationibus insperatus, illa derisus, cum tanta sæculi vetustas, et tot ejus natiuitates uno igne hauriuntur. Quis tunc spectaculi latitudo? quid admirer? quid rideam? ubi gaudeam?

"glory of the saints rising
 "again, thenceforth what a
 "kingdom of the just? what
 "a city the new Jerusalem?
 "Yet *there remain other spec-*
 "tacles, the last and eternal
 "day of judgment, *that day*
 "unwisdomed for by the nations,
 "that day derided by them;
 "when all the succession of
 "ages shall be swallowed up in
 "one conflagration. What a
 "prodigious spectacle will
 "this be? How may I ad-
 "mire?

"greatest of all spec-
 "tacles, the last and
 "eternal judgment
 "of the universe.
 "How *shall* I ad-
 "mire, how laugh,
 "how rejoice, how
 "exult, when I be-
 "hold so many
 "proud monarchs,
 "and fancied gods,
 "groaning in the
 "lowest abyss of
 "darkness; so many
 "magi-

"gaudeam? ubi exultem? tot spectans ac tantos reges, qui in
 "caelum recepti nuntiabantur, cum ipso Jove ac ipsi suis testibus
 "in imis tenebris congemiscentes? item praesides persecutores
 "Domini nomini, faevioribus quam ipsi contra Christianos flavi-
 "erunt flamma instantibus liquefactos; praeterea sapientes illos
 "philosophos coram discipulis suis una conflagrantibus, quibus
 "nihil ad Deum pertinere suadebant, quibus animas aut nullas,
 "aut non in pristina corpora redituras adfirmabant; etiam poe-
 "tas non ad Rhadamanti, nec ad Minois, sed ad inopinati
 "Christi tribunal palpitantes. Tunc magis tragendi audendi,
 "magis scilicet vocales in sua propria calamitate. Tunc histri-
 "ones cognoscendi solutiores multo per ignem. Tunc spec-
 "tandus autiga, in flammea rota totus ruber: Tunc xylistici con-
 "templandi, non in gymnasiis, sed in igne jaculati. Nisi quod
 "nec tunc quidem velim visos, ut qui malim ad eos potius con-
 "spectum insatiabilem conferre, qui in Dominum deservierunt.
 "Hic est ille (dicam) fabri aut quæstarii filius, sabbati destructor,
 "Samarites, et demonium habens. Hic est quem a Juda redem-
 "missis, hic est ille arundine et colaphis diverberatus, sputamen-
 "tia dedecoratus, felle et aceto potatus. Hic est quem clam
 "discentes subripuerunt, ut resurrexisse dicatur, vel hortulanus
 "detraxit, ne lactuca sua frequentia commensantium adloderen-
 "tar. Ut talia spectes, ut talibus exultes, quis tibi prætor, aut
 "consul, aut quæstor, aut sacerdos de sua liberalitate præstabit?
 "et tamen hæc jam quodammodo habemus per fidem spiritus
 "imaginante representata. Ceterum qualia illa sunt, quæ nec
 "oculis vidit, nec auribus audivit, nec in cor hominum ascenderunt?
 "Credo, circo et utraque cavea, et omni studio gratiora."

" mire ? how *may* I laugh ?
 " how *may* I rejoice ? how
 " *may* I exult ? when I be-
 " hold so many and so great
 " kings, *who were reported to*
 " *have been received up to hea-*
 " *ven*, groaning in infernal
 " darkness, *together with Ju-*
 " *piter and his adherents ?*
 " likewise governors, perfe-
 " cutors of the name of the
 " Lord, dissolving in insult-
 " ing flames, more fierce than
 " they themselves raged
 " against the Christians ;
 " moreover, those wise phi-
 " losophers, blushing before
 " their disciples, burning to-
 " gether with them, *whom*
 " *they persuaded that God had*
 " *no concern with the affairs of*
 " *the world, whom they assur-*
 " *ed, either that men were not*
 " *endued with souls, or that*
 " *they did not return into their*
 " *former bodies ;* poets also
 " trembling, not before Rha-
 " damantus, nor before Mi-
 " nos, but at the *untought-*
 " *of* tribunal of Christ.—
 " Then the tragedians will
 " be more audible, more
 " loudly lamentable in their
 " own calamity," &c.

" magistrates, who
 " persecuted the
 " name of the Lord,
 " liquefying in fierc-
 " er fires than they
 " ever kindled a-
 " gainst the Chris-
 " tians ; *so many*
 " sage philosophers
 " blushing in red hot
 " flames, with their
 " deluded scholars ;
 " *so many* celebrated
 " poets trembling
 " before the tribu-
 " nal, not of Minos,
 " but of Christ ; *so*
 " *many* tragedians
 " more tuneful in
 " the expression of
 " their own suffer-
 " ings ; *so many*
 " dancers"—

Such is the passage here appealed to, in Tertul-
 lian. I mean not to argue on the propriety, or to

enter into a vindication of it. My point is to expose the shameful mutilation which Mr. G. has been here guilty of. Who can observe with indifference, how he culls every sentence, that is adapted to his purpose of vilifying the Father; nay, often takes a part of one, and leaves out the remainder? He selects each furious expression of "the zealous African," but passes over the reasons assigned by him. To induce us the more readily to condemn the zealot, and to *enliven* the picture not coloured enough already, he inserts the words "red hot flames;" and lest the sufferers should be deemed only *few in number*, he makes the frequent addition of *so many* magistrates,—*so many* poets, &c. though no such expressions occur in the original. Thus he continually exaggerates the relation, too dismal and horrid without such aggravation. I cannot, therefore, but think, that, if it is "an *infernal* description," which in an equivocal sense of the word we may allow, our author has rendered it still more so by his unfair and partial translation—Besides, after he has quoted *the most offensive sentences*, he affectedly asks "leave of the humanity of the reader to draw a veil over the rest of this infernal description, which, he says, the zealous African pursues in a long variety of affected and unfeeling witticisms*."

I should be glad to know where our historian finds this "long *variety* of affected and unfeeling witticisms." In Tertullian, after a sentence or two, speaking of the stage-players and wrestlers of the Roman games, as being in the same deplorable situation, we have words of a different import, expressive of the indignities and reproaches cast on our Saviour by the Jews; which he retorts on the

deluded nation, at that time, to be convinced of their error. And concludes with a very rational observation: How unprofitable and trifling such amusements are, in comparison of that ineffable bliss, "which eye hath not seen; nor ear heard, "neither hath it entered into the heart of man to "conceive."

But I beg leave *particularly* to ask the reason why Mr. G. appeals to this passage of Tertullian as a proof of his asserting the "condemnation of the "wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans?" Tertullian only instances false gods, deified monarchs, inhuman magistrates, profligate actors, and atheistical philosophers; and unless these come under the denomination "of the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans," our author must be charged with gross misrepresentation.

IV.

We come now to the fourth instance of the liberty our author takes with Tertullian. Having spoken in high terms of the virtues of the Primitive Christians, he proceeds thus *: "Near a century afterwards, Tertullian, with an honest pride, "could boast, that *very few* Christians had suffered by the hands of the executioner, except on "account of their religion." This glorious commendation Mr. G. disgraces by the following note. "He adds, however, with some degree "of hesitation, "aut si † aliud jam non Christianus ‡."

I first observe that Tertullian says not only *very few*, but, more emphatically, *none* §: "No Chris-

* Page 481.

† Note 83. c. xv. Tertullian. Apolog. c. 44.

‡ In Rigalt's edition we read, Aut si et aliud, &c.

§ Nemo illic Christianus, &c.

“ than is in that number,” &c. That Tertullian expresses any degree of “ hesitation,” I cannot perceive *. However that be, it is certain that the primitive Christians did not look on any one as a true member of their society who scandalized his profession by his immoral practices †. If this be so, our author has undoubtedly shewn his *kind* intention, even at the hazard of inconsistency, to tarnish the encomium he himself has given the professors of Christianity, even without a sneer, in these words : “ But the primitive Christian demonstrated his faith by his virtues, and it was very justly supposed, that the divine persuasion which enlightened or subdued the understanding, must, at the same time, purify the heart, and direct the actions of the believer ‡, &c.”

V.

Our historian says §, that “ among the various articles (of luxury) which excited the pious indignation (of the primitive Christians) was the practice of shaving the beard, which, according to the expression of Tertullian, is a lie against our own faces, and an impious attempt

* There is a note in Rigalt's edition at this place, which will quite clear Tertullian from any suspicion of hesitation. His words are (Apolog. p. 34. not. l.) “ ER enim *μακαριστὸς*, ut ait Arrianus Epicteti interpres, *λογὸν μὲν ἰσχυροῦς ἔργον δ' ἄλλοτε*. Appellatione Judæi Christianum intelligit.” L. ii. c. 9.

† This remark is particularly confirmed by a canon which we read in Dupin, (Life of St. Basil, tom. ii. p. 530.)

“ Dans le canon quarante-cinquième, il remarque que le nom de Chrétien ne servira de rien à celui qui mène une vie indigne d'un Chrétien.” “ The name of Christian will be of no service to him who leads a life unworthy of a Christian.”

‡ Page 479.

§ P. 483, 484.

“ to improve the works of the Creator *.”—In opposition to this, I would observe, that the expression of Tertullian cannot well be translated, “ *a lie against our own faces* :” He says, indeed, “ † Will he please God, who alters his countenance with a razor? *unfaithful* to his face,” &c. This, I suppose, is the passage which Mr. G. hints at: We find nothing at all in Tertullian of the other part of his sentence, “ an impious attempt to improve the works of the Creator.” The Fathers may sometimes have carried their attention to minute ceremonies too far, and been too fond of frivolous austerities; yet surely this can give no foundation for heightening their excesses, or aggravating their foibles. I shall have occasion to shew, in the prosecution of my work, that Mr. G. has servilely adopted the sarcasm from a modern writer.

VI.

Mr. G. says, “ † Yet, notwithstanding the many favourable occasions which might invite the Roman missionaries to visit their Latin provinces, it was late before they passed either the sea, or the Alps; nor can we discover, in those great countries, any assured traces, either of faith or of persecution, that ascend higher than the reign of the Antonines.”

At note 170, he adds, “ With regard to Africa, see Tertullian ad Scapulam, c. 3 ”

Now Tertullian, in c. 3. treats of a different subject; and in c. 4, so far is he from speaking of Christianity as being slow, that he particularly dwells on the rapid increase, and the vast number

* Note 88. c. xv. Tertullian de spectaculis, c. 23.

† “ An Deo placebit qui vultus suos novacula mutat? *infidelis erga faciem suam*,” &c.

‡ Page 510.

of converts to the faith. Even our author has, hereafter*, cited the passage with this view. "What will you do," says Tertullian†, "with so many thousands of men and women of all ages, of every dignity, voluntarily delivering themselves up to you? How many and how great fires, what numbers of swords will you have occasion for?" &c. I do not know how Mr. G. can impartially refer to Tertullian for a proof of his assertion. For, by his mentioning so emphatically the immense number of those who had embraced the Christian religion, it inevitably follows that it could not be recently founded, or only propagated at the late period our historian pitches upon. It must not be denied, however, that some of the authors cited by him countenance his opinion; yet it is surprising he should crowd in among them Tertullian, whose authority would have been more aptly appealed to, where he speaks of "the eagerness with which the gospel was received on the burning sands of Africa."

VII.

Our historian wilfully disguises *Marcion*, a chief heretic‡, "under the name of a stranger from Pontus, who proposed to fix his residence in the

* Note 187. c. xv.

† Tertullian ad Scapulam, c. iv.

" Quid facies de tantis millibus hominum, tot viris ac sœminis, omnis sexus, omnis ætatis, omnis dignitatis offerentibus se tibi? Quantis ignibus, quantis gladiis opus erit? Quid ipsa Carthago passura est decimanda à te, cum propinquos, cum contubernales suos illic unusquisque cognoverit, cum viderit illic fortasse et tui ordinis viros ac matronas, et principales quasque personas, et amicorum tuorum vel propinquos vel amicos? Parce ergo tibi, si non nobis, parce Carthagini, si non tibi; parce provinciæ visa intentione tua obnoxia facta est concussionibus et militum et inimicorum suorum cujusque."

‡ Page 496.

" capital;

“ capital; from whom the Roman church received, in a single donation, the sum of two hundred thousand sesterces.”

He refers us to Tertullian*, who speaks of this person in a very different manner, and informs us, that, after this donation, he set forth heretical opinions; on which, the church returned him his money, and expelled him from her society.

Mr. G.'s design in thus concealing Marcion's name, and representing his case in a different manner from what Tertullian, whom he cites, has done; appears to be, that he might the more easily describe the church, as being in an opulent luxurious state†, eager to extort the possessions of its members; and also that he might more covertly pass over the material circumstance mentioned by the Father, that the great sum was in a disinterested manner returned to him again.

VIII.

Our author says ‡, “ the pagan magistrates *sometimes* proceeded with more temper and moderation than is usually consistent with religious

* Note 134. Tertullian de præscriptione, c. 30.

— “ Marcion quidem cum ducentis sestertiis quæ ecclesiæ intulerat, novissime in perpetuum discordium relegati, ventura doctrinarum suarum disseminaverunt.”

† Father Paul, of ecclesiastical benefices and revenues, speaks of this matter in a more accurate and ingenuous manner (English translation, 8vo edit.):

P. 7. “ A remarkable instance of these large contributions, was that of Marcion, about the year 170, who made an offering of 500 drachmas of gold at one time, in the church of Rome. But because he held certain unsound doctrines in matters of faith, she expelled him out of her congregations, and returned him all his money, believing she would have been polluted, in keeping the money of an heretic.”

‡ Page 529.

“deal.” This he instances by the example of Pliny, and would corroborate his observation by informing us, that “Tertullian expatiates on the fair and honourable testimony of Pliny, with much reason and some declamation*.”

The chapter referred to, speaks of Pliny, and the emperor his master, in a language very different from applause. Tertullian says, “that the Christians were not allowed the common privilege even of all other criminals, that of speaking in their own behalf;” and continues thus with respect to Pliny himself,—“† Pliny the younger, being governor of the province, condemned some of the Christians, and degraded others; and being alarmed at the great number of them, consulted the emperor Trajan what he should do with the rest.”

Tertullian does not appear in this passage “to expatiate on the fair and honourable testimony of Pliny” in a strain of declamatory approbation, as we should imagine he did from the words of Mr. G. For the governor proceeded to judgment against the Christians, before he had consulted the emperor. Tertullian, therefore, could not well pass any encomium on such severe conduct as this towards the Christians. Was there indeed the least doubt about his sentiment, the continued strain of just censure, with which he lashes “the moderate Trajan’s answer,” must immediately determine it ‡.—If we may judge from the words of

* C. xvi. note 23. Apolog. c. 2.

† “Plinius enim secundus, cum provinciam regeret, *damna-*
“*ris* quibusdam Christianis, quibusdam *gradu puls*, ipsa tamen
“multitudine perturbatus, quid de cetero ageret, consulit tunc
“Trajanum imperatorem” Apolog. c. 2.

‡ “Tunc Trajanus rescripsit, hoc genus inquirendos quidem
“non esse, oblatos vero puniri oportere. O sententiam neces-
“sitate

of this father, our author has not, without good reason, infected the limited patriotic *sentiments*; when he says, "the pagan magistrates *sometimes* proceeded with more temper and moderation than is usually consistent with religious zeal." Nor does he give us reason to credit "the temperate policy of the Roman legislators, and the humane lenity of the emperor and his prefect"; on whom our historian seems to think he cannot sufficiently lavish his compliments, though he thereby shows himself to be as infensible as the Romans to the unjust sufferings of the Christians†.

"*fitate confusum! negat inquirendos, ut innocentes, et mandat puniendos, ut nocentes. parci et sevit. dissimulat, et animadverrit. Quid temetipsum censura circumvenis? Si demnas, cur non inquiris? Si non inquiris, cur non et absolvis? solum Christianum inquiri non licet, offendi licet.*" &c.

* P. 541. &c.

† There is another reflection made by Mr. G. on Tertullian, which, as it cannot be called a misrepresentation, I shall place in a note.

Our author says, note 194. c. xv. "When Tertullian assures the pagans, that the mention of the prodigy" (of the darkness at the passion of our Saviour) "is found in *Arcanis* (not *Archivis* vel *vestris*) (see his Apology, c. 21.) he probably alludes to the Sibylline verses, which relate it exactly in the words of the gospel."

In answer to this, it may be said, that the word *Arcanis* may imply *Archivis*; they have at least been considered as synonymous terms by judicious writers. Rigalt, in his edition of Tertullian, writes it *Archivis* in the note on this passage, though it is *Arcanis* in the text. The learned Beza also, in quoting part of this chapter, transcribes the word *Archivis*, "quem Romani in suis *Archivis* habeoant," Tertullian, Apol. c. 21. (Beza Comment, in Marc. xv. 33.) Besides, there is not the most distant intimation of Tertullian's alluding to the Sibylline verses, which the penetrating, though prejudiced, eye of our historian vaunts to have discovered.

Having

Having convicted Mr. Gibbon of so many unfair quotations from Tertullian, I proceed now to give a very striking instance of his

Misrepresentation of Sulpicius Severus.

Our author says *, “ In the council of Laodicea
“ (about the year 360) the Apocalypse was tacitly
“ excluded from the sacred canon, by the same
“ churches of Asia, to which it was addressed; and
“ *we may learn, from the COMPLAINT of Sulpicius*
“ *Severus, that their sentence had been RATIFIED by*
“ *THE GREATER NUMBER of Christians of his time.*”

It happens rather unluckily for the credit of our historian, that *Sulpicius makes no complaint*; nor do we meet, in that author, with any *ratification of such a sentence*. I have great reason to assert, that I have had the satisfaction of discovering the passage to which Mr. G. does not choose to refer his reader; at least, I have the sentiment of Sulpicius on the subject; It is thus introduced: “ † Some time af-
“ terwards *Domitian*, the son of Vespasian, perse-
“ cuted the Christians. At which time, he ba-
“ nished John the apostle and evangelist into the
“ island Patmos; where he wrote and published
“ the book of the sacred *Apocalypse*, (*which indeed is*
“ *not received by some, either through folly or impi-*
“ *ety,*) the secret mysteries being revealed to him.”
The sense and connection point out this as the pas-

* Note 65. c. xv.

† Sulpicius Severus, l. ii. c. xlv. p. 399. 8vo edit. Hornius.
“ Interfecto deinde tempore, *Domitianus*, Vespasiani filius, per-
“ secutus est Christianos. Quo tempore, *Joannem* apostolum at-
“ que evangelistam in Pathmum insulam relegavit: ubi arcanis
“ tibi mysteriis revelatis. librum sacræ Apocalypsis (*qui quidem*
“ *a PLERISQUE aut stulto aut impio non recipitur*) conscrip-
“ tum edidit.”

sage to which Mr. G. alludes. At least we must suppose this, till he can produce some other passage from this author, on which he might found his remark. *The complaint*, as it is styled, of Sulpicius Severus, is so important as to be penned up in a short parenthesis. And though we might expect, from the representation of Mr. G. to find in this author the formal account of "the tacit exclusion of the Apocalypse *," and the reasons displayed at length, which induced the Christians of his time to *ratify* the sentence of the council of Laodicea: Yet no reader, the most versed in Sulpicius, can discover any thing like this in his history. As to our author's saying, that "their sentence was *ratified by the greater number* of Christians of the time of Severus;" the original word *plerique*, which is translated by him "*the greater number*," cannot have this import here. Because it is impos-

* The author of the Remarks (p. 17, &c.) has given reasons for the conduct of the council of Laodicea; and shewed, that the tacit exclusion of the Apocalypse consisted, not in its being proscribed, but, in that it was not enjoined to be read.

The learned Dallæus (or Daillé) is of the same sentiment; that "it was not read in the church, because it was not found in the number of those books which the council decreed should be read."

"Cum postremus concilii Laodicensis canon, qui est 163
"codicis Græci ecclesiæ universæ, in ecclesiâ libros alios legi
"præterquam canonicos prohibeat, eosdem omnes ordine re-
"censet. Inseruit quidem in codice suo Dionysius exiguum prin-
"cipium canonis quo prohibetur ne, præter Veteris & Novi
"Testamenti volumina, ulli alii libri legantur; sed eorundem
"librorum catalogum prorsus omisit, veritus reor, ne eccle-
"siam Romanam offenderet, in qua multis ante annis Innocen-
"tius pontifex in Veteris Testamenti canonem retulerat Mac-
"cabæos, Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, Tobiam, Judith, quo-
"rum apud patres Laodiceos nulla est mentio, cum viginti
"duorum tantum Veteris Testamenti librorum meminerint, &
"à Novo de Apocalypsi tacuerint. Si cui rescissionis istius pro-
"babiliior occurrat ratio, per me eam edat licet: mihi quidem
"ea visus est verisimillima." *De vero usu Patrum*, p. 72.

able to represent Sulpicius Severus as taxing the greater number of Christians with folly and impiety. To make sense of the passage, it is necessary to suppose that he only meant *some*, or *several**, of the Christians were guilty of this folly and impiety.

Such then being the very material difference between the words used by Sulpicius Severus, and those assigned to him by Mr. Gibbon, can we avoid bringing him in guilty, either of "not consulting the original," or of wilfully perverting it? The misrepresentation, if it had passed undetected, would have furnished a notable argument against the canonical authority of the Apocalypse.

I shall here subjoin, for the sake of connection, another instance of misrepresentation which our author has been guilty of in speaking of that book. After his groundless remark of the complaint of Sulpicius Severus, which I have just now exposed, he thus pursues his note †.

"From what causes then is the Apocalypse as present so generally received by the Greek, the Roman, and the Protestant churches? The following ones may be assigned, 1. The Greeks were subdued by the authority of an impostor, who, in the sixth century, assumed the character of Dionysius the Areopagite. 2. A just apprehension, that the grammarians might become more important than the theologians, engaged the council of Trent to fix the seal of their infallibility on all the books of scripture, contained in the Latin vulgate, in the number of which the Apocalypse was fortunately included. (Fra

* If we only look into Stephens's Thesaurus, we shall find (vol. ii. p. 649.) on the authority of Quintilian, that *plerique* does not always imply a majority, but signifies *nonnulli*, *some*.

† Note 65. c. xv.

“ Paolo Maria del Concilio Tridentino, l. ii.) 3.
 “ The advantage of turning those mysterious pro-
 “ phesies against the see of Rome, inspired the
 “ protestants with uncommon veneration for so
 “ useful an ally. See the ingenious and elegant
 “ discourses of the present bishop of Litchfield on
 “ that unpromising subject.”

For the first of these remarks, Mr. G. quotes no authority; I shall therefore pass on to what he ob- serves on the determinations of the council of Trent. His partiality will appear in purposely omitting the important consideration which in- duced the council “ to fix the seat of their infalli-
 “ bility upon the Apocalypse.”

That very ridiculous reason, which our historian has singled out, is indeed mentioned by Father Paul; but, at the same time, the Father gives another more substantial reason on which the coun- cil built their determination. In short, it “ appears
 “ that they looked on the Apocalypse as having
 “ equal authority with the epistle of St. Paul to the
 “ Hebrews; that of St. James; the second of St.
 “ Peter; the second and third of St. John; and
 “ the epistle of St. Jude: Of the authenticity of
 “ which, though there had been doubt in former
 “ times, yet by use and custom, they had obtain-
 “ ed canonical authority.”

* Historia del Concilio Tridentino. Di Pietro Seave Polano, fol. edit. Lond. 1619.

L. ii. p. 148. “ Altri erano di parere, che tre ordini fossero
 “ stabiliti: Il primo di quelli, che sempre furono tenuti per di-
 “ vini; il 2° di quelli, *che altre volte hanno ricevuto dubio, ma*
 “ *per uso ottenuto autorità canonica;* nel qual numero sono le
 “ 6 epistole (cio è sotto nome di S. Paolo a gli Hebrei, di S.
 “ Giacomo, 2ª di S. Pietro, 2ª & 3ª di S. Giovanni, & una di
 “ S. Jude) & l'Apocalisse del Nuova Testamento, & alcune per-
 “ ticole degli evangelisti. Il 3° di quelli, che mai sono certi-
 “ ficati, &c.”

We have here an evident proof that Mr. G. is equally expert in misrepresenting a modern as an ancient writer, in that he wilfully conceals the most material reason, with a design, no doubt, to instil into his reader a notion that the authenticity of the Apocalypse is built on the slightest foundation.

As to "*the uncommon veneration* with which the " Protestants are inspired for the Apocalypse," because it " gives them the advantage of turning " some mysterious prophecies against the see of " Rome;" I shall only observe, that if the Protestants have just grounds for doing so; if our Mede and our Newton have, in a manner, demonstrated, however mysterious these prophecies may be thought at first sight, that, when applied to the history of the church, they become clear, and point out, in the most expressive manner; the rise and progress of the Romish corruptions; then, surely, whatever Mr. G. and such determined opposers of Christianity may think; Protestants have the justest grounds for receiving the Apocalypse, as the work of an inspired author, and for treating it with *uncommon veneration*.

Misrepresentation of CLEMENS.

Our author says, " * The epistle of Clemens " does not lead us to discover any traces of episcopacy either at Corinth or Rome."

I do not know what "*traces*" Mr. G. deems requisite " to lead us to discover episcopacy;" but the words of Clemens, in his epistle to the Corinthians, do really give evident proofs of it. For, otherwise, if that sacred order was not known in the church, it is perfectly surprising that Cle-

* Note 108. c. xv.

metis should say of “ * the apostles, that they ordained the first fruits of their labours to be “ *bishops* ; and gave them the charge of the rising “ church :” And furthermore, that “ they should “ lay down the necessary qualifications for a bishop, in order to keep a constant and proper “ succession ; foreseeing what contention there “ would be in succeeding ages respecting the name “ and office of a bishop.”—Yet these Clemens relates ; nay Clemens, himself was styled bishop of Rome.

And are not these sufficient traces of episcopacy ? Can such passages as these be adduced from an epistle, whose author is to be considered as ignorant of such a distinction, or of such an order of men in the church ? But I leave the determination to the judgment of the reader.

* Clementis *Episcopi Romani Epistola ad Corinthios*, I. SS, Patrum Aposol. opera, tom. i. 8vo: edit. Russel.

§ 42. p. 158. Οἱ ἀποστόλοι — κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῇ πνεύματι*, εἰς ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΣ καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων καινῶν. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς, Ὡς.

§ 44. Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἘΡΙΣ ἔΣΤΑΙ ἘΠὶ ΤΟῦ ὌΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΗΣ.* Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν πρόνοιαν εἰληφότες τελίαν, κατίστησαν τοὺς προσημαμένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἱπνομένη διδῶκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδίδωνται ἑτέροι δοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταδόντας ὑπὲρ ἑκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἡτοιμασμένων ἀνδρῶν, συνυποκινῶσας τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῇ ποιμνίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀθανάτως, μεμεταρρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ παντῶν, τούτους ἐν δικαίᾳ νομίζομεν ἀποβαλίσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. κ. τ. λ.

* See the notes in Russel.

Misrepresentation of IRENÆUS.

"The knowledge of foreign languages," says our author, "was frequently communicated to the contemporaries of Irenæus, though Irenæus himself was left to struggle with the difficulties of a barbarous dialect, whilst he preached the gospel to the natives of Gaul."

In support of this, he appeals to * Irenæus.

Let us see what Irenæus really says. "† You will not expect from me, who live among the Celtæ, and am called upon to make use of a barbarous language, the art of speech which I have not learned; nor the elegant power of a writer, which I have not affected; nor the harmonious diction, which I am ignorant of: But my writing is simple, true, and plain."

May we not here appeal to every candid reader, whether there is the least foundation for Mr. G.'s assertion? Irenæus does not say he was ignorant of the Celtic language, or that "he was left to struggle with the difficulties of a barbarous dialect;" on the contrary, he plainly says, "he was called upon to make use of it." It is beyond all doubt, therefore, that our author adopt-

* Note 74. c. xv. 3d edit. Irenæus adv. Hæres. Proem. P. 3.

† Irenæus adversus Hæres. Erasmi, fol. edit. 1532.

P. 2. "Non autem exquires à nobis, qui apud Celtas commoramur, et in barbarum sermonem plerunque avocamur, orationis artem quam non didicimus, neque vim conscriptoris, quam non affectavimus, neque ornamentum verborum, neque suadellam quam nescimus: sed simpliciter et vere et idiotice, ea quæ tibi cum dilectione scripta sunt, cum dilectione percipies, et ipse augeas ea penes te, ut magis idoneus quam nos, quasi semen et initia accipiens à nobis: et in latitudine sensus tui multum fructificabis ea, quæ in paucis à nobis dicta sunt, et potenter assures his qui tecum sunt, ea quæ invalide à nobis relata sunt."

ted the remark ready made to his hands by Middleton, who, as will afterwards be taken notice of, thus wrested the passage to serve his own purpose. But such gross blunders are the necessary consequences of blindly transcribing quotations, without ever examining their accuracy, by looking into the authors quoted.

Misrepresentations of CYPRIAN.

I.

Our author, after disparaging the characters and conduct of the first bishops in general, singles out the prelate Cyprian, as the particular object of his censure; which he thus expresses:

“ * From the imperious declamations of Cyprian, we should naturally conclude, that the doctrines of excommunication and penance formed the most essential part of religion; and that it was less dangerous for the disciples of Christ to neglect the observance of the moral duties, than to despise the censures and authority of their bishops. Sometimes we might imagine that we were listening to the voice of Moses, when he commanded the earth to open, and to swallow up, *in consuming flames* †, the rebellious race which refused obedience to the priesthood of Aaron; and we should sometimes suppose, that we heard a Roman consul asserting

* Page 501, 502.

† Mr. G. has introduced, in this laboured, yet distorted, description, as in the case of Tertullian, the expressive words, *consuming flames*, to complete the catastrophe, notwithstanding he is not warranted to insert them by the original relation of Moses. His manner of working up the whole of this sentence, plainly intimates that he took this opportunity of reflecting on the conduct of Moses.

“ the majesty of the republic, and declaring his
 “ inflexible resolution to enforce the rigour of the
 “ laws. If such irregularities are suffered with
 “ impunity,” (it is thus that the bishop of Car-
 thage chides the lenity of his colleague) “ if such
 “ irregularities are suffered, there is an end of
 “ EPISCOPAL VIGOUR, an end of the sublime and
 “ divine power of governing the church, an end
 “ of Christianity itself.”

With what bitterness of language, and vehement severity, does Mr. G. here inveigh against Cyprian *. How studied is his translation of the prelate's expressions? How skilfully does he arm every word to attack and lash his conduct? How artfully does he palliate the charges laid against the sectaries; and censure, severely censure, the advocates of the established orthodox church? I shall therefore shew that Cyprian may be cleared from several of our author's unjust reflections.

If we are to credit the relation of Cyprian, we find a black character given of *Felicissimus*, and of his heretical associates *Fortunatus*, *Novatus*, &c. that he was “ † an enemy of Christ, no new one, “ but long ago separated,” from the church, “ for “ his many and heinous crimes; a defrauder of “ money entrusted to him; a debaucher of vir- “ gins, and a scandalous adulterer.”—Then follows the particular passage which our author has inserted in his history, to which, that his misrepres-

* See also the ungenerous, inadequate motives which our historian *cautiously* supposes *might* induce Cyprian to suffer martyrdom, p. 55c.

† Cyprian. Epist. 59. edit. Oxon.

P. 126.—“ hostem Christi, non novum, sed jam pridem ob
 “ crimina sua plurima et gravissima absentum—pecuniæ sibi
 “ commissæ fraudator, stuprator virginium, matrimoniorum
 “ multorum depopulator atque corruptor.”

entation may be more manifest, I shall oppose the literal translation of the whole connected paragraph in Cyprian.

“ * But if these things be so, my beloved brother, *that the audacity of the most wicked men is to be dreaded, and that iniquitous persons are suffered to accomplish, by rash and desperate actions, those things which they are not able to effect by justice and equity*; the exertion of episcopacy is rendered vain, the sublime and divine power of governing the church becomes useless, nor can we longer continue to be Christians, *if it is come to this pitch, that we are to be daunted by the threats and treachery of the most abandoned men.*”

Our author, in this instance, has served Cyprian in the same manner, as he had before served Tertullian. He doth not, as a faithful interpreter would have done, translate the whole passage, but he picks out such parts of it as are best adapted to his purpose, of conveying to his reader a notion of unreasonable severity predominating in the prelate's conduct, while he industriously omits other parts of the passage in which the matter is explained. Surely this is not a mode of translation very consist-

“ * Quod si ita res est, frater carissime, ut nequissimorum timeatur audacia, et quod mali jure atque æquitate non possunt, temeritate ac desperatione perficiant; actum est de Episcopatus vigore, et de ecclesiæ gubernandæ sublimi ac divini potestate; nec Christiani ultra aut durare, aut esse jam possumus, si ad hoc ventum est, ut perditorum minas atque insidias pertimescamus.”

The words marked in a different character, are left out by Mr. Gibbon in his translation.

I may notice also the inaccurate reference of our Author to epist. 69. whereas this matter is contained in epist. 59. Fell's edition, Oxon. to which particular edition of Cyprian's works he refers us, note 82. cap. xvi.

ent with the vulgar ideas of good faith.—As our author transcribed the harsh expressions of Cyprian, he ought to have transcribed also the reasons which provoked him to use them. Both being blended in the same passage, they must both remain or fall together. In how concise and palliative a manner does our advocate for the sectaries translate the original words expressive of *great audacity, injustice, and iniquity*, by the softened term “*irregularities?*” Upon the whole, if the accusation of the bishop be strictly true, we must allow the propriety of his words and conduct. But if, through other motives, he deviates into calumny, and rash declamation, as some imagine*, it behoves us not to condemn these persons as heretics, before we have sufficient grounds for the charge. This must be granted, that whatever was the cause of the dispute, these persons had separated themselves from the established church, and thereby exposed themselves to the censure of its governors, whose authority they had disdained and shaken off.—However, even this construction will not clear Mr. G. from the charge of partial misrepresentation.

* Beausobre is an apologist for the heretics, as they are called.

Mosheim impartially observes, “that there were double faults on both sides, and how far the Sectaries were culpable, we can form no proper judgment, as we have such an imperfect and partial representation of the case.”

De rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. saec. iii. p. 500.

He elsewhere speaks of Cyprian, as “acting with a manly courage and propriety, and tempering severity with lenity, in the case of the *Libellatici*; and of those who had apostatized:” (de lapsis) yet, says he, “Cyprian proceeded to great extremities, in the contest with *Novatus* and *Felicitus*.” Ibid. p. 490.

II.

"Cyprian," says Mr. G. * "upon his conversion, had sold his gardens for the benefit of the poor. The indulgence of God (most probably the liberality of some Christian friends) restored them to him again." See Pontius, c. 15.

Our author, in this instance, as well as in several others, has inserted words in a parenthesis, which are not to be found in the writer to whom he appeals, as the learned reader will see by the note †, in which the original passage is transcribed. This seems to be done in order to throw an air of trivial absurd superstition on the circumstance.

III.

Mr. G. insists on "the inhuman Maximin's promiscuous massacre" being "*improperly* called a persecution †." And again he says, "notwithstanding the cruel disposition of Maximin, the effects of his resentment against the Christians were of a very local and temporary nature." For the truth of this remark, he quotes the authority of "Firmilianus §, a Cappadocian bishop of that age, who," says he, "gives a just and confined idea of this persecution."

Now although the promiscuous massacre might be improperly stiled a persecution; yet Firmilianus

* Note 83. c. xvi.

† Pontius vit. Cypriani, c. 15, p. 8. edit. Oxon.

"Et hi erant quotidiani actus destinati ad placentem Deo hostiam sacerdotis; cum ecce Proconsulis jussu ad hortos ejus (ad hortos inquam, quos inter initia fidei suae venditos, & Dei indulgentia restitutos, pro certo iterum in usus pauperum vendidisset, nisi invidiam de persecutione vitaret) cum militibus suis princeps repente subitavit."

‡ P. 559.

§ Note 117. c. xvi. Firmilianus apud Cyprian, epist. 75.

relates *, that there really “ arose a *severe persecution against the Christians*, however temporary or “ local it might be, on account of some natural “ calamities; as earthquakes,” &c. of which the superstitious Pagans supposed them to be the cause. “ Therefore,” he says, “ they were oppressed by “ many hardships and grievances:” And, “ to increase their wretchedness and misery, unusually “ distressing, a fierce and cruel persecutor was governor of the province. So that their only safety consisted in flying from the country.”

It is not much to be wondered indeed, that our historian should speak of this persecution as being *improperly* so called; since with him, “ exile, imprisonment, confiscation of goods and slavery “ in the mines, are but *mild punishments* †.” He seems to look on no scene with abhorrence, which is not stained with blood, and covered with racks and gibbets. But the more humane and moderate reader may think it sufficiently dreadful, and that

* P. 222. edit. Oxon. “ Ante viginti enim & duos fere “ annos, temporibus post Alexandrum Imperatorem, multæ “ istæ conflictationes & pressuræ acciderunt, vel in commune “ omnibus hominibus, vel privatim Christianis; terræ etiam “ motus plurimi & frequentes extiterunt, ut per Cappadociam “ & per Pontum multa subruerent, quædam etiam civitates in “ profundum receptæ, disrupti soli hiatu devorarentur, ut ex “ hoc persecutio quoque gravis adversus nos Christiani nomini “ fieret. Quæ post longam retro ætatis pacem repente obortæ, “ de inopinatæ & insueto malo ad turbandum populum nostrum “ terribilior effecta est. Serenianus tunc fuit in nostra provincia Præses, acerbis & diris persecutor. In hac autem perturbatione constitutis fidelibus, & huc atque illuc persecutionis metu fugientibus, & patrias suas relinquentibus, atque “ in alias partes regionum transeuntibus (erat enim transeundi “ facultas, eo quod persecutio illa, non per totum mundum, sed “ localis fuisset), &c.

† P. 545, &c.

the severity of the persecution will compensate for its locality *.

There are some other instances of our author's misrepresentation of Cyprian, on the supremacy said to be given by the ancients to the church of Rome. But these, for the sake of connection, I shall give with those of other authors misrepresented on this subject.

Misrepresentations of ORIGEN.

I.

I might retort on our historian the accusation which he has falsely laid against Origen, "of mutilating the objections of his adversary †." But the charge has been so fully proved against Mr. G. by the able author of the remarks on his history ‡, that it would be a needless repetition. I pass on, therefore, to what our author says on "the meanness and ignorance of the first Christians," which he tells us, with an apparent pleasure and satisfaction, was "*a very odious imputation, which seems to be less strenuously denied by the apologists, than it is urged by the adversaries of the faith §.*"

I shall now lay before the reader, a convincing proof that Mr. G. has added falsehood to "*this unfavourable picture* ¶," by saying, that "this charge,

* It is thus the learned Dodwell speaks of this persecution; Dissert. xi. 51. and thereby gives a much more adequate idea of it, than what Mr. G. has inaccurately copied from him, as will be shewn hereafter, can well give.

† Note 101. c. xv.

‡ P. 28.

§ P. 513.

¶ Our author well observes, that "this unfavourable picture," which has but "a faint resemblance" to recommend

“ charge, this odious imputation, *was not strenuously denied* by the apologists.” He has referred us but to one,* for a proof of his words; I might alledge the testimony of others † to prove the reverse. However, I am content to keep to Origen, the one which he has singled out, and doubt not but I shall fully prove that this apologist has *most strenuously denied* the chief accusation of Celsus, that “ the obscure Christian teachers were as mute in public, as they were loquacious and dogmatical in private. Whilst they cautiously avoided the philosophers, they mingled with the rude and illiterate croud ‡.”

Origen having previously observed, that “ many of the philosophers of Greece embraced Christianity, on account of that *gracefulness* which manifested itself therein, not only to slaves, as Celsus intimated, but to persons of such superior judgment §;” goes on to confute the charge in these words :

mend it, “ betrays by its dark colouring and distorted features the pencil of an enemy.” May we not then ask Mr. G. if he has not passed a sentence of condemnation on himself, in reviving and bringing to the light this distorted portraiture?

* Note 182. c. xv: Celsus ap. Origen, l. iii. p. 138.—142.

† Dr. Watson (Apology, p. 151) has given us the authority of Jerome and Arnobius to contradict the malicious accusation. The reader will find this, and the several other important charges alledged against the First Christians by the Pagans, well accounted for by Turner. See his *Calumnies on the primitive Christians*.

‡ Origen observes, one chief rise of this opinion was the perverse interpretation of that passage in Scripture; “ not many wise, not many noble, not many rich, &c. were called” to the faith: they therefore concluded, that no wise, no noble, no learned persons embraced Christianity.

§ Origen contra Celsum, 4to edit. Hoefschelius, p. 121.

ἐπὶ ΣΕΜΝΟΝ τι ἰφάνη τοῖς ἀνθρώποις χριστιανισμός, οὐ μόνους (ὡς ὁ Κέλσος, ᾠεῖται) τοῖς ἀνδραποδωδιστοῖσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλήσι φιλοσοφῶν.

“ How

“ How can Celsus-with any decency reproach
 “ us, as saying, let no learned, no wise, no pru-
 “ dent person come into our society ; yea indeed,
 “ let the learned, the wise, and the prudent man,
 “ who is willing, enter among us : Yet, neverthe-
 “ less, if there be any unlearned, unwise, unin-
 “ structed, illiterate, let him come also ; for such,
 “ when they embrace the faith, the word promises
 “ to heal, rendering them all worthy of God. But
 “ it is a rank falsity to say, that the teachers of the
 “ gospel choose to persuade the foolish alone, and the
 “ ignoble, and the insensible, and slaves, and women,
 “ and children : These also the Word calls, to make
 “ them better ; but it invites also those that are
 “ superior to them. For Christ is the Saviour of
 “ all men, particularly of the faithful, whether
 “ they be wise or simple +.”

Again he says, “ See in what a manner Celsus
 “ *falsely accuses us*, in comparing us to quacks and
 “ itinerant praters, who hold forth in market-
 “ places. But what silly babbling do we utter ? or
 “ in what respect is our conduct like theirs ? For
 “ we, by our reading, and explanations of what
 “ we read, would exhort men wholly to the wor-
 “ ship of God, and the practice of virtue ; and

† P. 141. (Spencer, edit. Cantab. 1658) πῶς οὖν ἐυλόγως
 ἐγκαλεῖ ὁ Κέλσος ἡμῖν ὡς φάσκουσι “ μηδεὶς προσίτω πεπαιδευμένος, κ;
 “ μηδεὶς σοφός, μηδεὶς φρόνιμος· ἀλλὰ προσίτω μὲν πεπαιδευμένος, κ;
 “ σοφός, κ; φρόνιμος, ὁ βουλούμενος· οὐδεὶς δ’ ἥττον προσίτω, κ; ἢ τῆς
 “ ἀμαθῆς, κ; ἀνόητος, κ; ἀπαιδεύτος, κ; ἡπίας, κ; γὰρ τοὺς τοιούτους
 “ προσελθόντας ἐπαγγέλλεται θεραπεύειν ὁ λόγος, πάντας ἀξίους
 “ κατισκαύξων τοῦ Θεοῦ· ΨΕΥΔΟΣ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ, ΜΟΝΟΥΣ
 “ ἡλιθίους, κ; ἀγενεῖς, κ; ἀνωσιδῆτους, κ; ἀνδράποδα, κ; γυναικαί, κ;
 “ παιδάρια ΠΕΙΘΕΙΝ ἘΘΕΛΕΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΣ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝΤΑΣ
 “ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΙΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ.” κ; τοὺτους μὲν γὰρ καλεῖ ὁ λόγος, ἵνα
 αὐτοὺς βελτιώσῃ. καλεῖ δὲ κ; τοὺς πολλοὺς τούτων διαφέροντας· ἵνα
 Σωτῆρ πάντων ἰσὺν ἀνθρώπων ὁ Χριστός, κ; μέγιστα πιστῶν, ἵνα συνετῶν,
 ἢτε ἀπλουτέρων.

“ would

“ would deter them from despising the Deity, and
 “ from doing all things contrary to sound reason *.”

But as I need not multiply proofs to detain my reader, though Origen continues on the vindication for several pages, I shall only add, that he once more asserts,

“ We Christians exert our utmost endeavours,
 “ that our assembly should be filled with wise and
 “ judicious men; and we are then bold to intro-
 “ duce in our public reasonings, those things which
 “ are esteemed most good and sacred, when we are
 “ crowded with hearers of understanding †,” &c.

I now appeal to the reader, if the power of language can express, in a more emphatical manner, that “ *the odious imputation was most strenuously denied by the apologists.*” With what assurance then could our historian cite the authority of Origen to confirm a charge which he labours to invalidate *?

That many of the primitive Christians were of the lower class of people, cannot be denied. Our

* “Ορα δὴ καὶ ἐν τούτοις τίνα τρόπον ἡμᾶς ΣΥΚΟΦΑΝΤΕΙ ἰξομοίων τοῖς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς τὰ ἐπιρρητότατα ἐπιδεικνύμενοις καὶ ἀγείρουσι. ποῖα δὲ ἐπιρρητότατα ἐπιδεικνύμεθα; ἢ τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσιον πράττομεν; Οἱ καὶ δι’ ἀναγνωσμάτων, καὶ διὰ τῶν εἰς τὰ ἀναγνωσμάτων διηγεσέων προτρέποντες μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων εὐθείᾳ, καὶ τὰς συνδρόνους ταύτης ἀρετὰς ἀποτρέποντες δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πάντων τῶν παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον πραττομένων; &c.

† ἡμεῖς γάρ, ὅση δύναμις, πάντα πράττομεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ φρονησάντων γινώσκειν τὸν σύλλογον ἡμῶν, καὶ τὰ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγιστα καλὰ καὶ θεία τότε τολμῶμεν ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν διαλέγοις φέρειν εἰς μέσον, ὅτε ἰσχυροῦμεν συνετῶν ἀκρατῶν, &c.

* Origen tells us also, that “ a strict examination was
 “ made into the morals of the Christians; and that persons
 “ were appointed to inquire into the former conduct, and
 “ principles of every one, before he was admitted into the
 “ Christian Congregation.” This proves, that not *every criminal or profligate* could gain admission into the Christian society at his pleasure, as Mr. G. asserts, p. 479, 480.

author

author has well accounted for it*. Yet still it will not admit of a doubt, if we have any regard to the truth of history, both sacred and profane, but that the apostles, and their successors, addressed themselves to emperors and princes, and disputed with orators and philosophers, as well as preached to the mechanic and slave: "King Agrippa was *almost* "persuaded," by the reasoning of St. Paul, "to become a Christian." And Felix, though a governor, "trembled" at his authoritative reproof. His eloquence was more than a counterbalance for the rhetoric of Tertullus, and Athens was puzzled by, and astonished at, his understanding.

Julian the Emperor was made to know, by these mean and ignorant Christians, the danger of his apostacy; and Constantine was converted to the faith. The Empress Mammoea did not disdain to listen to "the eloquent exhortations of "Origen," and her son Alexander favoured the Christians.

These effects were not to be brought about by "private loquacity," or silly babbling; nor "by "mingling with the rude and illiterate crowd" alone. The disciples of Christ "*preached aloud,* "upon the house-tops;" disputed in the learned synagogues, and harangued in the public streets and market places. This they did, though re-proved, though punished for their conduct, and still did they persist in spite of human authority, and opposition. In fact, these obscure illiterate

* "Such is the constitution of civil society, that whilst a few persons are distinguished by riches, by honours, and by knowledge, the body of the people is condemned to obscurity, ignorance, and poverty. The Christian religion, which addressed itself to the whole human race, must consequently collect a far greater number of proselytes from the lower than from the superior ranks of life." P. 513.

teachers spoke too publicly for the eloquence of infidelity, and reasoned too powerfully for the philosophy of paganism.

II.

But Origen furnishes Mr. G. with another piece of censure, which he expresses in a note*.

"It may be hoped, that none, except the heretics, gave occasion to the complaint of Celsus, (ap. Origen, l. ii. p. 77.) that the Christians were *perpetually* correcting their gospels."

In opposition to this reflection, I shall content myself with fairly stating the accusation of *Celsus* himself, which, however malignant and groundless, does not authorise our historian to say, that "the Christians were *perpetually* correcting their gospels." The translation of his words is this:

"Afterwards, Celsus says, that *some of the believers*, as if they were inebriated, allowed themselves to alter the gospel from its first copy; and this, *three, or four, or even many times*: and that they transformed it to have wherewith to deny the accusations alledged against them. But I know of *no others*," replies Origen, "that altered the gospel, than the Marcionites, and Valentinians, and I think also the Lucanians. However, this charge we are speaking of does not affect the gospel itself, but relates to those only who have dared to *erase and corrupt* it †."

We

* Note 185, c. xv.

† Origen, lib. II. p. 77. Spencer Ed.

μετά ταῦτα "τις τῶν πισυνόντων φησὶν ὡς ἐκ μέθης ἄκοιτας εἰς τὸ
ἰφθαίμει αὐτοῖς, μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον"
"ΤΡΙΧΗ ΚΑ'Ι ΤΕΤΡΑΧΗ, ΚΑ'Ι ΗΟΛΛΑΧΗ. καὶ μεταωλάττειν,
"ὡς ἔχουσιν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀρνησθαι." ΜΕΤΑΧΑΡΑΨΑΝΤΑΣ
Δ'Ε ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ "ΑΛΛΟΥΣ ΟΥΚ ΟΪΔΑ, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ
Μαρκίου, Μαρκίου,

We here see that Celsus himself only accuses *some* of the believers of altering the gospels; and who they were Origen informs us, strictly confining the charge to particular heretics*.—And as the heathens seldom made a distinction between the heretics and the orthodox Christians, the accusation is easily accounted for: Yet Mr. G. would convey to his reader the idea, that Celsus extended "*his complaint of perpetually correcting the gospels*" to the Christians in general, as if it had been a practice *perpetually* adopted by the whole body of believers. A charge this much to our author's favourite purpose of drawing a most odious picture of the religion of Christ.

"The learned Origen," says Mr. G. "who from his experience as well as reading, was intimately acquainted with the history of the Christians, declares in the most express terms, that the number of martyrs was very considerable†. But the general assertion of Origen may be explained and confirmed by the particular testimony of his friend Dionysius, who in the immense city of Alexandria, and under the rigorous persecution of Decius, reckons only ten men and seven women who

Μαρκίανος, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου, οἵμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Λουκᾶνου. τοῦτο δὲ λεγόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶν ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τῶν τολμησάντων ραδιουργήσαι τὰ εὐαγγέλια.

* Eusebius (l. v. 28.) is also referred to by Mr. G., chiefly, I should suppose in confirmation of the observations in the text of his history. At least, the words of Eusebius, "they fearlessly altered the sacred Scriptures," *γραφῶς μὲν θείας ἀφόβως ῥαδιουργήκασιν*, can relate to the heretics alone of whom he had been speaking.

Beausobre, Histoire de Manichée, &c. (tom. i. c. iv. § 2. p. 306, &c.) though a strenuous advocate for the sectaries, allows the truth of this charge.

† P. 546 and note γ 1. c. xvi. Origen advers. Celsum, l. iii. p. 116.

"suffered

“suffered for the profession of the Christian name.”

It has been already judiciously observed by the author of the remarks †, that the testimony of Origen is *insufficient* to prove the above assertion: which therefore may be considered as a third instance of our author's misrepresentation of that Father.

I mean now to shew that his eager desire to lessen the number of martyrs, has not permitted him to give the testimony of Dionysius fairly and impartially as it stands in Eusebius.

Misrepresentations of EUSEBIUS.

The testimony of this historian is appealed to by Mr. G †, in confirmation of his assertion “that the number of martyrs was very inconsiderable.”

Our author is not very accurate in giving the exact number of the martyrs, specified by name in Eusebius, when “he reckons them to be only ten men and seven women:” But a matter of this little consequence I shall not insist upon.

Let us rather notice, what is much more material, that he only enumerates those persons who are *expressly said to have lost their lives*; concealing from us, that in the same place mention is made of *several who underwent the severest tortures*. For instance, *four* Christians, in particular, are said to have been *delivered up to the magistrate* ‡: And Dionysius speaks also of “*a whole band of soldiers*,” who presented themselves before the tribunal,

† P. 69. “Because Origen lived before the time of the longest and severest persecutions which the Church experienced,” namely, “those of Decius and Diocletian.”

† Note 74, c. xvi. Eusebius, l. vi. c. 41.

‡ Hero, Ater, Isidorus, and Dioscorus, *καρδιστοι*:

“and

“ and professed openly that they were Christians *.” We read then, “ although the soldiers thus rushing in, affrightened the judges and the court, yet *they made the condemned Christians more ready and courageous to bear their sufferings †.*” By this we should understand, they were destined to cruel torments, if not to death itself.—I might too insist on the many intimations there are of others, whom death released from their severe servitude and lingering tortures. I might observe, that he speaks of many whose stronger constitutions could bear the oppressive burden; or who, in the *benevolent* language of Mr. G., suffered “ *only the milder punishments of exile, imprisonment, slavery, or working in the mines ‡;*” with which their *humane* magistrates were content to punish them. Very different then would be the number of these suffering martyrs. But that many more Christians laid down their lives in so long and severe a persecution than those who are here specified by name, is plainly demonstrable from the narration of this historian. It was not for Mr. G.’s purpose, to acquaint his reader with this. As a few in number were particularly pointed out by name, it afforded him a specious pretext for bringing in Dionysius, as affirming that no others had suffered. However, as a second misrepresentation,

II.

Our author, happy to have an opportunity of shewing that a zealous professor of Christianity

* ἈΘΡΟΨΟΝ δὲ τι σύνταγμα τραυματικόν, Ἀμμοῦ καὶ Ζήνωνος καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ἰγγίνης· καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτερος Θεόφιλος, ἐπέκειντο πρὸ τοῦ διακατερίναι.

† καὶ τοὺς μὲν καινομύτους ἐνδρασιγματούς. “ ad ea quæ perpessuri erant promptissimi et confidentissimi: says Valeſius.

‡ Page 545.

could at the same time lead a very profligate life, has taken special care to select from the number of these martyrs, one, who "was likewise accused of robbery," to use his own words*. But the Greek historian here makes an essential addition: "† He was accused indeed, but *falsely*," says he, "as being an associate with thieves: He was acquitted," continues he, "of this most foreign and malicious charge, and being indicted, because he was a Christian, was burnt to death among the other criminals."

One can hardly think, that any one, who had looked into the original, would dare thus absolutely to contradict the plain testimony of the author he *pretends* to follow.

For Mr. G. should be reminded, that the original word *συκοφαντηθη* means, "he was *falsely* accused;" it is translated by Valesius ‡ (whose edition he uses), "*falso* accusatus fuerat," and properly, as § Scapula and Budæus will inform him:

* Note 74. c. xvi.

Dionysius (apud Euseb. l. vi. c. 41.)

† Νεμισίου δὲ τις, κακίῃος Αἰγύπτιος· ἘΣΥΚΟΦΑΝΤΗΘΗ ΜΕΝ, ὡς δὴ σύνδικος ληστῶν· ΑΠΟΔΥΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ Δ' Ε ΤΑΥΤΗΝ παρὰ τῷ ἱερατονάρχῃ ΤΗΝ ἈΛΛΟΤΡΙΩΤΑΤΗΝ ΚΑΤ' ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗΝ· ΚΑΤΑΜΗΝΥΘΕΙΣ ΩΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ, ἥκει δωμότης ἐπὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον. ὁ δὲ ἀδικώτατος διπλάως αὐτὸν ἢ τοὺς λησῆς ταῖς τε βασάνοις καὶ ταῖς μάστιξι λυμηνάμενος, μετὰ τῶν ληστῶν κατίφλεξε.

‡ Page 240.

§ Scapula translates the word *συκοφαντω* "*falso* criminor; "I am *falsely* charged with a crime." Budæus says (p. 13.), that this *vero* is used "when we speak of an *innocent* person; "qui *de-infante* dicitur." It is made use of in this acceptation also in the New Testament, the style of which the Fathers generally imitated; for a part of St. John the Baptist's charge to the soldiers (Luke iii. 14.) is *μηδὲ συκοφαντῆσαι*, "neither accuse any one *falsely*." The above are evident proofs that it can be taken in no other sense.

But

But, above all, what Eusebius himself subjoins, though our *impartial* historian thinks proper to conceal it from us, that "this very person was *acquitted* of the *false* accusation, even before the censure, his enemy," must at once clear up every doubt of the kind.

What possible evasion then can Mr. G. have recourse to, to convince the world that I have *falsely* accused *him* of a gross misrepresentation of Eusebius?

III.

Our historian says, "The bishops of the most considerable cities were removed by exile, or death; the vigilance of the magistrates prevented the clergy of Rome, during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election*." For this he appeals to Eusebius†.

Yet this Father says only, that "in the persecution of Decius, when Fabianus, bishop of Rome, suffered martyrdom in that city, Cornelius was elected to his bishopric‡." So that Mr. G. has no reason to say, from the testimony of Eusebius, that "the clergy of Rome were prevented, during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election."

It should be remarked likewise, that Eusebius imputes "the resentment, by which Decius was actuated against the favourites of his predecessor Philip§," to be the cause of his raising this per-

* Page 560.

† Note 121. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. vi. c. 39.

‡ Ἰὺν Ὁ Φαβιανὸς ἐπὶ Ρώμης μαρτυρίῳ τελευτήσας Κορηλῖος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν διαδέχεται.

§ ὁ δὲ δὴ (Decius) τοῦ πρὸς Φίλιππον ἔχθους ἵπκα διωγμὸς κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἰγίεται.

secution against the church. Now this is directly contrary to the assertion of our author *.

IV.

“ The revolt of Maxentius,” as Mr. G. asserts, “ immediately restored peace to the churches of Italy and Africa, and the same tyrant, who oppressed every other class of his subjects, shewed himself just, humane, and even partial towards the afflicted Christians†.”

In support of this, he appeals ‡ to Eusebius, and continues his note in these words : “ But as Maxentius was vanquished by Constantine, *it suited the purpose* of Lactantius to place his death among those of the persecutors.”

Our author here, in the strain of Middleton, introduces his favourite expression *it suited the purpose* of Lactantius, in order to insinuate to his readers that this father, as well as the others, was ready at all times, without the least regard to truth, to adopt any fact that tended to promote the design he had in view. I need not however dwell on this, as I have something of greater consequence to remark ; which is, although Mr. G. represents these two Fathers, as contradicting each other in their accounts, yet this is so far from being true, that the testimony of Eusebius coincides with, and corroborates, that of Lactantius. For Eusebius says, “ Although Maxentius at first favoured the Christians with a view of popularity, yet afterwards, being addicted to magic and every other iniquity,

* Page 560. “ The virtues of Decius will scarcely allow us to suspect that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor, &c.”

† Page 577.

‡ Note 167. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14.

" he exerted himself in persecuting the Christians, in a more severe and destructive manner than his predecessors had done before him *."

From these words it appears, that not only Lactantius, but Eusebius also, ranks this emperor amongst the number of the persecutors. This being the case, Mr. G. must quote other authority to prove "*the justice, humanity, and kind partiality of Maxentius towards the afflicted Christians.*" But surely if he had been acquainted with any such authority, he would not have exposed himself to the charge, which I now bring against him, that it suited his purpose here to falsify the testimony of Eusebius.

V.

Our author, unwilling to interrupt the long calm of prosperity which he describes the church as enjoying, by any violent act of the emperor Aurelian; would have us be of opinion, that " only some hostile intentions are to be attributed to that emperor †."

To corroborate this, he cites the testimony of several of the Fathers; but says, " their language is in general so ambiguous and incorrect, that we are at a loss to determine how far Aurelian had carried his intentions before he was assassinated ‡."

* Eusebius Hist. Eccles. l. viii. c. 14.

τούτου καὶ Μαξέντιος — ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν κατ' ἡμᾶς πύσιν ἐν ἀρεσκίᾳ καὶ μελαγχολίᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο, ταύτην τε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν κατὰ χριστιανῶν αἰνῆαι προβάττει διωγμὸν, ἑσθίας ἐπιμορφαίαν — ὃν μὲν εἶος ἴσθαι ἡλιασθῆναι, τοῦτοντες ἔργῳ ἀνατίθηναι. Eusebius then describes his cruelties and acts of wickedness; and after taking particular notice of his being strongly inclined to magic arts, he says, ὃν χάριν καὶ τῷ καὶ ἡμῶν σφοδρότερον ἢ οἱ πρότεροι καὶ πυκνότερον ἐπιτίθειτο διωγμῷ.

† Page 561.

‡ Note 124. c. xvi.

However, one of the authorities he appeals to, *Hieronym. in Chron. p. 177*, makes against his assertion, by saying, "When Aurelian had raised a persecution against the Christians, a thunder-bolt rushed down near him and his attendants, and not long after he died *."

This plainly implies much more than *hostile intentions*: It absolutely says, that a persecution was begun by him, and speaks of the time past; as if he was deterred by this circumstance from pursuing these hostile measures. Our author has not only thus perverted the fact, but also has been guilty of a gross blunder, in quoting the *Chronicon* of Jerome, instead of that of Eusebius, which he should have called it; *Jerome* being only the interpreter of it. This was the consequence of his looking no farther than Dodwell for this remark, and not rightly understanding his reference.

VI.

Mr. G. says, "On some particular occasions, when the magistrates were exasperated by some personal motives of interest or resentment, when the zeal of the martyrs urged them to forget the rules of prudence, and perhaps of decency, to overturn altars, to pour out imprecations against the emperors †, or to strike the judge as he sat

* Eusebii Cæsar. Chronicon, D. Hieronymo Interprete. Ed. per Janssonium.

P. 177. "Aurelianus cum adversum nos persecutionem movisset, fulmen juxta eum comitumque ejus ruit, ac non multo post——occiditur."

† This is far from being compatible with the truth of history: For we know from the authority of Tertullian, and other Fathers; nay, from Mr. G.'s own words, that the *Christians always* prayed for the safety and welfare of the Emperors and of the State.

" on

“ on his tribunal, it may be presumed that every
 “ mode of torture, which cruelty could invent, or
 “ constancy could endure, was exhausted on those
 “ devoted victims *.”

To illustrate this, he adds the following note †:
 “ The behaviour of Ædeshus to Hierocles, præfect
 “ of Egypt, was still more extraordinary, *λογοις*
 “ *τε και εργοις* ‡ *τον δικαστην περιβαλων.*
 “ Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 5.”

We cannot but remark the partiality of this account. Mr. G. takes care to omit the reasons or provocations assigned in this very passage by Eusebius, which might be some justification of the behaviour of Ædeshus.

Eusebius, speaking of that judge, says, “ § he
 “ not only punished the Christians beyond the li-
 “ mits of his power, but treated the most venera-
 “ ble men with every varied disgrace; violating
 “ the chastity of the Christian virgins, and women
 “ of the utmost modesty, by delivering them up
 “ to be defiled and prostituted by whoremongers.”

* Page 583.

† Note 178. c. xvi.

‡ This word *εργοις* is forcibly rendered *striking* by Mr. G. in his text; but a candid reader might well understand it, from the sense and connection of the whole passage, to imply only some menacing gesture.

§ Eusebius de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 5.

σμηκρον τῷ χρόνῳ ὑγερον — Ἀιδίσιος. μετὰ μυρίας ὄσας ὁμολο-
 γίας καὶ πολυχρόνους διαμῶν κακώσεως. ἡγεμονικῶς τε ἀποφάσας, ὅτι αἱ
 τοῖς κατὰ παλαιότητα δίδονται μεταλλοῖς. — τελευταῖον δὲ ταῖς τῆς
 Ἀλεξανδρείας πόλεως τῶν αὐτῶν συνδῶν διαστῆναι Χριστιανῶν διαφύλαττα,
 περὶ τοῖς προσπαύοντων ἐμπαρακαλῶντα. καὶ τότε μὲν σαρμῶς ἐνδύσας
 ποικίλως ἐνυβρίζοντα. τότε δὲ γυναικῶς σαφεινῶς τῆς αὐτῶν καὶ
 αὐτοπαρθένης ἀσκητείας εἰς αἰσχρίας ὕβρις ποροτρόφος παραδίδόντα.
 ταυτὸν ἐγχυριζήσας τῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅτι διὰ ἀφόρητα ἵνα αὐτῷ τὰ
 γυνώμενα ἴδοι, παραγγέλλει βασιλεῖν πρὸς αὐτοῖς. λόγος τι καὶ ἔργον τὸν
 δικαστὴν αἰσχρῶς καὶ ἀτιμῶς περιβαλὼν, καὶ τὸν τούτοις κατεργῶν ἐν
 μάλα βασιλῶν πολυτρόπως ὑπομένειν αἰκίας, τὴν ἐδελφικὴν ἀσκητὴν
 κατο, δαλῆτῃ παραδοθεὶς τελευταῖον.

“ On beholding these intolerable grievances the courageous Ædesius approached with unanimous confidence, and by *his words and actions raised in the judge both shame and disgrace* : For which, being seized and fettered, he endured with constancy every torture,” which cruelty could invent, “ and was at last thrown into the sea.”

This being the case, it became Mr. G. to lay it open before us ; it was his duty, as an *impartial* historian, not to have left the reader at liberty to imagine the insult was unprovoked. For, on viewing the horrible picture here given of the judge, the behaviour of Ædesius will not appear to be *so very extraordinary* as our author would represent it : But we are almost tempted to applaud his zeal.

VII.

“ Each of these sects,” (namely, “ of the Gnostics, the Basilidians *, the Valentinians, the Marcionites, and the Manicheans,”) says Mr. G. “ could boast of its doctors and martyrs †.” To confirm this he cites the authority of Eusebius ‡.

Now the chapter referred to by Mr. G. in Valesius's edition, “ treats principally of the martyrdom of Polycarp § : One Germanicus also is particularly mentioned : And twelve other Christians, Eusebius tells us, were martyred together

* Mr. G. seems to speak very inconsistently with this in his note on this passage, where he says, “ Some of the Gnostics, (the Basilidians) it seemed, declined and even refused the honour of Martyrdom.” How then could these same Basilidians be said to boast of their martyrs ?

† Page 462.

‡ Note 33, c. xv. Eusebius Hist. Ecclesiast. l. iv. c. 15.

§ P. 129. Vales. Ed. *τούτοις ἱεῖς πρὸ τῆς ἀμφὶ τοῦ Πολυκάρπου διηγήσεως τὰ κατὰ τοὺς λατῶνς αὐτοῖν οὐσι μάρτυρας,*

“ with

“ with Polycarp *. *One Marcionite* is instanced as “ crowned with martyrdom, and another man “ named Pionus †.” These are all that are recorded by the historian; and no mention is made of any sect but that of Marcion.

We now see that Eusebius does not give our author those sufficient grounds for his remark, which he would represent him as giving.

Nay elsewhere, when Eusebius says that “ many “ of the followers of Marcion had suffered martyr- “ dom †,” he does not intimate that the other sects could boast of their martyrs: Nor is he quoted even by Beausobre §, the great apologist for the sectaries, in a more extensive view than relating to the Marcionites. It is more probable, therefore, that the thought was suggested to our author by Beausobre in the above passage, or else by Bayle, whom he here quotes, and whose words are not very unlike Mr. G.’s “ They boasted of their pre- “ tended martyrs.” The long note which Bayle has on this subject, might readily furnish him with the reference to Eusebius.

VIII.

Our author refers to Eusebius for a passage, to which his reference does not direct us. His words

* P. 135.—τοιαῦτα τὰ κατὰ τὸν μαρκιῶν Πολύκαρπον σὺν τοῖς ἀπὸ Φιλαδελφίας δάδικοις, τοῦ ἐν Σμύρῃ μαρτυρήσαντος.

† καὶ ἄλλα μαρτύρια συνῆπτο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Σμύρῃν πεπραγ-
μένα ὑπὸ τῇ αὐτῇ περιόδῳ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς τοῦ Πολυκάρπου μαρτυρίας.
μὲθ’ ἧς ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤ’ Α ΜΑΡΚΙΩΝΑ ΠΛΑΨΗΣ.
πρὸς τοὺς δι’ εἶναι δοκῶν περὶ παραδοχῆς ἀνίστηται. τῶν γὰρ μὴ τότε
περιβόητος μέγας εἰς τίς ἔγνωρίζετο Πιότος.

‡ Eusebius Hist. Ecclesiast. l. v. c. 16.

οἱ πρῶτοι γὰρ ἀπὸ Μαρκίου αἰρέσις ——— πλείονους ὄρους ἔχον
Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίας λέγουσι.

§ Histoire de Manichée, &c. tom. ii. livre iv. c. 8. § 3.

are,

are, "But he" (Flavius Clemens) "had scarcely
 "finished the term of his annual magistracy, when,
 "on a slight pretence, he was condemned and ex-
 "ecuted. Domitilla (the wife of Clemens, the
 "niece of Domitian) was banished to a desolate
 "island on the coast of Campania *," &c. To
 illustrate this passage, he adds the following note,
 (62. c. xvi.) "The isle of Pandataria, according
 "to Dion. Bruttilus Præfens (ap. Euseb. lib. iii. 18.)
 "banishes her to that of Pontia, which was not
 "far distant from the other," &c.

In opposition to this, as an additional instance
 of our author's misrepresentation, I assure the
 reader, that there is no mention made of Bruttilus
 Præfens in Eusebius, lib. iii. c. 18. (see Valesius'
 edition.) Can we think it probable then, that any
 person who had consulted Eusebius, would have
 made such an assertion? or how can we excuse
 such a vain affectation of learning? I doubt not
 but I shall be able hereafter to account for this
 error, to the satisfaction of the reader.

I shall close these proofs of our author's unfair
 quotations of Eusebius, by the following reflec-
 tion :

Whatever may be thought of the accusation
 thrown out by Mr. G. against this historian, "of
 "suppressing all that could tend to the disgrace of
 "religion†;" surely every body must agree,
 though Mr. G. himself does not confess it, that,
 by the artful management of his quotations, as we
 have seen in the above instances, he suppresses
 whatever might do credit to religion.

* Page 539.

† See the vindication of Eusebius from this aspersions by the
 author of the remarks, p. 70 and 76, &c.

Misrepresentation of JUSTIN MARTYR.

Mr. G. in stating the "three methods of escaping martyrdom," begins with the following as the first:

1. "A modern inquisitor would hear with surprise, that whenever an information was given to a Roman magistrate of any person within his jurisdiction who had embraced the sect of the Christians, the charge was committed to the party accused; and that a convenient time was allowed him to settle his domestic concerns; and to prepare an answer to the crime that was imputed to him."

In confirmation of this account he says; that, "in the second apology of Justin, there is a particular and very curious instance of this legal delay," &c.

The reader will observe, that Mr. G. does not make a particular reference to any section or division of this part of Justin's works; with what view, we may shrewdly suspect, when I tell him, that, after an accurate perusal of the whole second apology, I can boldly affirm, that the following instance is the only one that bears the most distant similitude to what Mr. G. relates as above on the authority of Justin.

What I find in Justin is as follows: "A woman being converted to Christianity, is afraid to associate with her husband, because he is an abandoned reprobate, lest she should partake of his sins. Her husband not being able to accuse her, vents his rage in this manner on one Ptolemæus, a teacher of Christianity, and who had converted

* Page 553.

† Note 98. c. xvi.

" her.

“ her. The Centurion being his friend, throws
 “ Ptolemæus into prison, and is afterwards per-
 “ suaded to bring him forth, and to put the usual
 “ question to him, *whether he is a Christian*, or
 “ not? Then, upon his true and faithful confes-
 “ sion, that he was a Christian, the Centurion *caused*
 “ *him to be fettered*, and he was *punished* in prison
 “ *for a long time* *.”

Shall this then be called “ *an instance of legal de-
 “ lay?*” a delay of punishment it could not be, for
 he was not only *confined for a long time*, but was
chastised, or *tortured* during his imprisonment;
 nay, even previous to his trial. Is there any thing
 said here of “ *the charge being communicated to the*
party accused? or *was there any time allotted him*
to settle his domestic concerns?” Why then does
 Mr. G. attempt to obtrude upon us a sentiment of
 his own, as that of Justin? Though he takes every
 opportunity to pass encomiums on the *humanity* of
 the Roman magistrates, it is incumbent on him to
 produce better evidence than this of their being
 content to put in force only their *milder* punish-
 ments, as he is pleased to stile them; lest, when the
 comparison is drawn between them and the modern
 inquisitor, it should not appear to be much in their
 favour.

• Justin Martyr. Apolog. ii.

ὁ δὲ ταύτης ἀπὸ τῆς αἰῆς, πρὸς ἐκείνῃ μὴ μὴ δυνάμενος ταύτῃ ἐπι-
 λήγειν, πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τινα, δὲ Ουεβίκιος ἐκολάσαστο, διδάσκαλον
 ἐκείνης τῶν χριστιανῶν μαθημάτων γινόμενον, ἐτράπητο, διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ
 τρόπου. ἱκατόνταρχοι εἰς δισμὰ ἐμβάλλοντα τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φίλοι αὐτῷ
 ὑπάρχοντα, ἔπεισι λαβίσθαι τοῦ Πτολεμαῖου καὶ ἀπερωτῆσαι εἰ αὐτὸ
 τοῦτο μόνον χριστιανὸς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φιλαλήθη ἀλλ’ οὐκ
 ἀπατηλὸν οὐδὲ ψευδολόγον τῷ γράμνῃ ὄντα, ὁμολογήσαντα ἑαυτὸν
 μὲν χριστιανὸν, εἰ δισμοῖς γίνεσθαι ὁ ἱκατόνταρχος πιπύνηκε, καὶ ἐπὶ
 πολλοὺ χρόνους ἐν τῷ δισμωτικῷ ἐκολάσαστο. Ed. Thirlby, p. 109.

Misrepresentation of OPTATUS.

On the authority of this Father, Mr. G. informs us he makes the following note: "The ancient monuments published at the end of Optatus, p. 261, &c. describe in a very circumstantial manner, the proceedings of the governors in the destruction of churches. They made a minute inventory of the plate, &c. which they found in them. That of the church of Cirta, in Numidia, is still extant. It consisted of two chalices of gold, and six of silver: six urns, one kettle, seven lamps, all likewise of silver; besides a large quantity of brass utensils, and wearing apparel*."

Mr. G. in the preceding note had referred to *Dupin's* edition of Optatus; we therefore justly expect him to adhere to it in this note: But I do not find *any* of the above particulars specified at page 261 in *Dupin's* edition †, and only *some* of them in other places.

In the annotations of Balduinus, where he is speaking of the ornaments of the church, we read these words,—“ I pass over many traces of ecclesiastical antiquity which occur in this book of Optatus: As, for instance, what is afterwards written in it, that the churches of Africa had very many ornaments (as he calls them) of gold and silver in the time of Maxentius. But it is still more astonishing that Optatus signifies, there were such also in the African churches, at the time they were afflicted by impious tyrants. So also Augustin says, that in the time of Dio-

* Note 159. c. xvi.

† Fol. edit. Antwerp. 1702. In this edition, p. 261 relates to a different part of his work.

“ cletian,

" cletian, and of the persecution raised by him,
 " *the church of the Donatists at Circa had two*
 " *golden chalices, and six of silver, and a silver*
 " *lamp.*"

Besides the above, there is no further enumeration of the ornaments of the church in this place.

Neither do I find any thing similar to what Mr. G. relates " in the edict of Diocletian and Maximian," as given us by Optatus, " respecting the subversion of churches †;" in which, however, it is natural to expect that " the proceedings of the governors would be described."

Again, though there is a *particular description of Ciria*, in Numidia, given us in Optatus †; yet we do not meet with " this minute inventory" which our author specifies.

These several reasons must strongly incline one to suspect that Mr. G. *never consulted the original*; it is at least undeniably plain, that he did not use the edition he quotes. Have we not, therefore, a right to say, his presumption deserves censure?

• Annotationes Balduini.

P. 126. " Prætereo multa, quæ in hoc Optati libro occurrunt vestigia Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ: valui, quod in eo scriptum deinde est, Ecclesiarum in Africa, tempore Maxentii, fuisse quamplurimâ (ut vocat) ornamenta ex auro et argento."—" Sed mirum magis est, quod Optatus significat talia etiam fuisse in Africanis Ecclesiis, quo tempore alioquin Ecclesia sub impiis tyrannis afflicta jacebat. Sic et Augustinus lib. 3. contra Crescon. cap. 29. indicat, tempore Diocletiani, et persecutionis ab eo excitatæ, *Cirtensem Ecclesiam* Donatistarum habuisse calices duos aureos, et sex argenteos, et lucernam argentæam," &c.

† De Ecclesiarum Eversione, cap. ii. p. 143. 145.

† Histor. Carthagenensis Collationis, p. 344. 345.

Misrepresentations of LACTANTIUS.

I.

Mr. G. says, " The principal eunuchs, Lucian and Dorotheus, Gorgonius and Andrew, who attended the person, possessed the favour, and governed the household, of Diocletian, protected by their powerful influence the faith which they had embraced. Their example was imitated by many of the most considerable officers of the palace, who, in their respective stations, had the care of the imperial ornaments, of the robes, of the furniture, of the jewels, and even of the private treasury ; and though it might sometimes be incumbent on them to accompany the emperor when he sacrificed in the temple, *they enjoyed with their wives, their children, and their slaves, the free exercise of the Christian religion* *.

The above passage he grounds on the sole authority of Lactantius †. But it is strange that Mr. G. should appeal to this author, as his testimony makes much more against his assertion, than for it.

For Lactantius says, that " when the Christian officers, who attended the emperor at his rites of divination, had, by marking their foreheads with the sign of the cross, disturbed these rites, the chief of the Soothsayers informed Diocletian, that he could give no answer, because *profane* persons were present. The emperor then, being very superstitious, was highly incensed with them, and gave orders, that not only those Christians who waited on him during his religious performances, but *all the other Christians who were in the palace, should offer sacrifice ; and com-*

* Page 564.

† " Note 133. c. xvi. Lactantius de M. P. c. 10."

" *manded*

“ *manded that those who refused should be beaten with stripes *.*”

Now the only part of Mr. G.'s assertion, which Lactantius corroborates, is, that some of the Christians of the palace “ *accompanied the emperor when he sacrificed in the temple.*” Surely then this passage cannot be alleged as a proof of the favour shewn to the Christian officers: Nor can they be said to “ *have enjoyed the free exercise of the Christian religion,*” when we read in Lactantius that “ *they were obliged to offer sacrifice to a beathen divinity, or on refusal were so severely punished.*”

What apology can be made for thus asserting, on the sole authority of Lactantius, facts which Lactantius so expressly denies?

I shall hereafter shew, how much Mr. G. is here again indebted to the learning of Dodwell, though he has spoiled the remark of that author, by his attempt to disguise it.

* “ De mortibus persecutorum c. 10. Quam vero causam persequendi habuerit, exponam. Cum ageret Diocletianus in partibus orientis, ut erat pro timore scrutator rerum futurarum, immolabat pecudes, et in jecoribus eorum ventura quærebat. Tum quidam ministrorum scientes Dominum, cum adlisterent immolanti, imposuerunt frontibus suis immortale signum. Quo facto fugatis dæmonibus sacra turbata sunt. Trepidabant aruspices, nec solitas in extis notas videbant; et quasi non litassent, sæpius immolabant. Verum identidem mactatæ hostiæ nihil ostendebant, donec magister ille aruspicum tages, seu suspicione, seu visu, ait idcirco non respondere sacra quod rebus divinis profani homines intressent. Tunc ira furens, SACRIFICARE non eos tantum qui sacris ministrabant, sed UNIVERSOS qui erant in palatio, jussit, et IN EOS SI DETRACTASSENT, VERBERIBUS ANIMADVERTI.” P. 858. edit. Spark. Oxon.

II.

Mr. G. says, in a note where he treats of the persecution of Maximin*, "These writers" (Eusebius and Lactantius) "agree in representing the arts of Maximin; but the former relates the execution of several martyrs, while the latter expressly affirms, *"occidi servos Dei vetuit †."* (that is, *he forbade the servants of God to be slain.*)

Our historian, in this instance, makes a fresh attempt to set these two ecclesiastical writers at variance, probably hoping to overthrow, at least to invalidate the testimony of both. But it will appear that Lactantius and Eusebius "do not disagree" in their representations of the arts of Maximin, if we trust not to the "*mutilated representation*" of author, but consult the original passage.

For Lactantius says, "Although Maximin did indeed FORBID the Christians TO BE SLAIN, under the old pretext of Clemency;" yet, as the sentence proceeds, "*he gave EXPRESS ORDERS for them to be MAIMED and TORTURED. In consequence of which, the eyes of the confessors were scooped out, their hands and feet chopped off, and their nostrils and the flaps of their ears cut through ‡.*"

I now beg the reader will particularly observe, how totally the sense of Lactantius is altered, by the artful and unfair method in which Mr. G. has quoted him. That part of the sentence which he

* Pages 581, 582.

† "Note 175. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14. l. ix. c. 2—8."
"Lactantius de M. P. c. 36."

‡ "Lactantius, de Mortibus Persecutorum. c. 36.

"*Nam cum clementiam SPECIE TENUS profiteretur, occidi servos Dei vetuit, DEBILITARI JUSSIT. Itaque confessoribus effodiebantur oculi, amputabantur manus, pedes detruncabantur, nares vel auriculæ defecabantur.*" P. 892, 893. Spark. Oxon.

lays before us, is manifestly connected with the subsequent words, which, as *not being suited to his purpose*, he treacherously conceals. If the whole sentence had been transcribed by *our impartial historian*, we should then have seen that Lactantius does not *essentially* differ from Eusebius, as he expressly says that, by Maximin's command, the Christians suffered such excruciating tortures, as could not but frequently terminate in their death.

III.

There remains still a third instance of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting and perverting Lactantius, perhaps more flagrant than the last.

“ There were some governors,” says he, “ who from a *real or affected clemency*, had preserved their hands *unstained with the blood* of the faithful *,” &c. To give this the air of truth, he again appeals to a passage of Lactantius; which gives a reason for this conduct of the governors; the translation of which is as follows :

“ That they might have it in their power to boast, that they had put no innocent persons to death, for I myself have heard some boasting, that during their magistracy they had not shed innocent blood †.”

Mr. G. has here again picked out a short passage from Lactantius, without laying before us the words with which it is connected, that he might support his odd fancy of being the apologist for the heathen magistrates. To prove this to the most

* Page 585.

† Note 183. c. xv. “ Ut gloriari possint nullum se innocentium peremisse, nam et ipse audivi aliquos gloriantes, quia administratio sua, in hac parte, fuerit incruenta.”

Lactant. Institut. Divin. v. 11.

inadvertent reader, I need but transcribe the whole passage from Lactantius.

“ *But that punishment,*” says he, “ *is of the*
 “ *WORST kind, which is DISGUISED UNDER THE*
 “ *FALSE APPEARANCE OF CLEMENCY ; he is the*
 “ *more SEVERE, be the more SAVAGE executioner,*
 “ *WHO HAS RESOLVED TO KILL NO ONE : It is on*
 “ *this account that words cannot express, what great,*
 “ *what EXCRUCIATING KINDS OF TORTURES,*
 “ *JUDGES of this opinion have INVENTED to accom-*
 “ *plish their resolutions. Nor do they act in this*
 “ *manner so much, that they may have it in their*
 “ *power to boast, that they have slain no innocent per-*
 “ *sons (for I myself have heard some boasting, that*
 “ *their administration had been, in this respect, un-*
 “ *stained with blood), but for the sake of envy ;*
 “ *lest they themselves should be overcome, or*
 “ *the sufferers obtain the glorious reward of their*
 “ *virtue. Therefore they think of nothing but*
 “ *overcoming us in the punishments they invent. I*
 “ *saw in Bitbypnia, a magistrate wonderfully elated*
 “ *with joy, as if he had conquered a nation ; be-*
 “ *cause one who, for the space of two years, had*
 “ *with great fortitude withstood his tortures, at*
 “ *length seemed to yield. They strive, therefore, to*
 “ *overcome us ; and inflict the most exquisite pains*
 “ *on our bodies : Yet they are only solicitous lest the*
 “ *tortured wretches should expire. As if death alone*
 “ *could make us happy, and not torments also ;*
 “ *which, by how much the more severe they have*
 “ *been, are by so much the more virtuously glori-*
 “ *ous. But they give orders, with foolish obsti-*
 “ *nacy, that strict care be taken of the tortured, that*
 “ *their limbs may be repaired for other racks, and*
 “ *their blood be recruited afresh for punishment.*”

“ What can possibly be so pious, so kind, so humane * ? ”

Let the humane reader for one moment reflect what a different strain this is from the representation of our author. Who could think any one could be so ingenious as to pervert and wrest † such a passage as this is, to prove that “ some governors, through a REAL or AFFECTED CLEMENCY, had preserved their hands UNSTAINED WITH THE BLOOD of the faithful ? ”

* P. 451. “ Illud vero pessimum genus est, cui clementiæ species falsa blanditur ; ille gravior, ille severior est carnifex, qui neminem statuit occidere. Itaque dici non potest, huiusmodi iudices, quanta et quam gravia tormentorum genera excogitaverint, ut ad effectum propositi sui pervenerint. Hæc autem non tantum ideo faciunt, ut gloriari possint, nullum se innocentium peremisse, (nam et ipse audiivi aliquos gloriantes, quia administratio sua in hac parte, fuerit incruenta,) sed et invidiæ causa; ne aut ipsi vincantur, aut illi virtutis suæ gloriam consequantur. Itaque in excogitandis pœnarum generibus, nihil aliud quam victoriam excogitant. Sciunt enim certamen esse illud et pugnam. Vidi ego in Bithynia, præsidem gaudio mirabiliter elatum, tanquam barbarorum gentem aliquam subegisset ; “ quod unus, qui per biennium magna virtute resisterat, postremò cedere visus est. Concedunt igitur, ut vincant ; et exquisitos dolores corporibus immittunt ; et nihil aliud devitant, quam ut ne torti moriantur. Quasi vero mors tantummodo beatos faciat ; ac non etiam tormenta, quæ quanto fuerint graviora, tanto maiorem virtutis gloriam pariant. Illi autem pertinaci stultitia jubent, curam tortis diligenter adhiberi, ut ad alios cruciatus membra renoventur, et reparetur novus sanguis ad pœnam. Quid tam pium, tam benignum, tam humanum fieri potest ? Non curassent tam sollicitè, quos amarent. Hæc est Deorum disciplina. Ad hæc opera cultores suos erudiunt : hæc sic a desiderant.”

† It is necessary again, particularly to point out to the reader, that there is no full stop in Lactantius after the word “ incruenta,” (“ unstained with blood”) to complet the sense, as Mr. G. has unfairly represented it.

Had

Had Mr. G. asserted this as his own notion of the *clemency* of the heathen magistrates, we might not have been so astonished; as he seems to put off the feelings of humanity, when he speaks of the suffering Christians. But surely the more moderate part of mankind will think there is *nothing to glory of* in sparing the life of an *innocent* person. And hardly the most savage barbarian could boast of *humanity*, because, after torturing a wretch to the verge of death, he would not suffer the excruciated soul, worn out with the most cruel tortures, to be released from its intolerable anguish by death, but caused the decayed spirits to be refreshed, in order to endure again the lingering agonies of the rack.

I had collected many other instances of our author's *perverting* and *misrepresenting* the testimony of the Fathers, besides those I have already produced. But the reader will perhaps rather *blame* me for having produced *so much*, than require me to produce *more evidence**. I shall therefore close this head of the Misrepresentation of the Fathers, with a passage, which the reader cannot think *misapplied to Mr. Gibbon*, as it was at first particularly aimed at *another infidel, Mr. Toland*.

“ When I observe a person ransacking and mustering together all the silly trumpery of the an-

* The above proofs of the shameful usage which the primitive Christian writers have met with from Mr. G. most fully verify the complaint of their apologist *Cave*.

“ Si quis in eorum libris occurrit detectus mox augetur et amplificatur, si vel levissima hallucinatio exaggeratur, et in portentosum errorem provehitur; sacrum literarum interpretationes ab his adhibitæ, tanquam ludicræ, insipidæ, et plane ἀπεοσιδιστοι rejectuntur; rationes et argumenta, velut futilia, sculnea, imbecillia exhibentur. Quid verba multa? præ sæcundis saltem, sublimibus, acutissimisque nostri temporis ingeniis à plerisque irridentur.” Epistola Apologetica.

“cient heretics, grossly misrepresenting the books he
 “cites, only with design to satisfy a bigotted humour
 “against the Christian religion, I am obliged, by
 “my regards to the profession I make of the name
 “of Jesus, to lay open such vile imposture*.”

As I have at great length dwelt on our author's misquotations of the Fathers, my learned reader perhaps will not be displeased, if I vary the scene, by producing two or three of his classical friends, to shew what art Mr. G. has used to suit their authority to his purpose of throwing an odium on Christianity.

Misrepresentation of DION CASSIUS.

I have already given a curious instance of our author's asserting, on the authority of Dion Cassius, a fact not mentioned by that historian; I shall now produce a very singular proof of his endeavouring to conceal from us a passage really contained in him.

Mr. G. says, “In the various compilation of
 “the Augustan history (a part of which was com-
 “posed under the reign of Constantine), there are
 “not six lines which relate to the Christians; nor
 “has the diligence of Xiphilin discovered their
 “name in the large history of Dion Cassius†.” This note is introduced to confirm his assertion, “of the careless indifference, which the most co-
 “pious and the most minute of the pagan writers,
 “have shewn to the affairs of Christianity‡.”

It happens unluckily for our author, that this note, which he produces to support his observa-

* See the “Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament by Mr. Jeremiah Jones.”

† Note 24. c. xvi.

‡ Page 530.

tion, tends only to overthrow it : Since the truth of it must be inevitably destroyed, though *not without the justest impeachment of his veracity or learning*. For though in this place he dares to assure us, that “ the diligence of Xiphilin has not discovered even “ the *name of Christians* in the large history of “ Dion Cassius ;” yet, what is remarkably astonishing, hereafter he inconsiderately contradicts himself, by referring to a passage in Dion where the word appears *. That historian, speaking of Martia, says, “ She is reported to have exerted her utmost endeavours in behalf of the “ CHRISTIANS ; and to have benefited them “ greatly, as having great influence over Commodus †.”

What shall we say now ? Do we not discover *the name of Christians* in the history of Dion ? With what assurance then can Mr. Gibbon, after asserting a fact manifestly untrue, lay claim to *the merits of “ diligence and accuracy, the indispensable duty of “ an historian ?”* Or can he expect us to credit his assertion, that “ *he has carefully examined all the “ original materials ?”*

With regard to what he says of the Augustan history, he cannot surely mean that *no mention is made of the Christians* in that compilation. Or would he insinuate, that there are not *six lines together, in one passage*, which respect the Christians. This is but a pitiful evasion, if intended ; and if he did not mean it, he must acknowledge, that his false assertion is overthrown by the frequent notice

* Note 106. c. xvi. Dion Cassius, l. lxii. p. 1206.

† ἰσορεῖται δὲ αὕτη “ πολλὰ τε ὑπὲρ τῶν ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ σπουδασαί,” καὶ πολλὰ αὐτοὺς ἐνεργητικῶς, αὐτὴ καὶ παρὰ τῇ Κομμώδῳ πᾶν δυναμένη.

taken of them in several passages of that history, which he himself has had occasion to cite *.

I might particularly urge what is there related of the worship paid to Christ by the emperor Alexander Severus, recorded by Lampridius; and the law of the emperor Severus, forbidding the Christians, as well as the Jews, to make proselytes to their religion.

Misrepresentation of EPICTETUS *and* MARCUS ANTONINUS.

Our historian does not fairly state the words of Epictetus and Marcus Antoninus, with regard to the sentiments which the philosophers entertained of the Christians.—He says,

“ The behaviour of the Christians was too remarkable to escape the notice of the ancient philosophers; but they seem to have considered it with much less admiration than astonishment. Incapable of conceiving the motives which sometimes transported the fortitude of believers beyond the bounds of prudence or reason, they *treated such an eagerness to die, as the strange result of obstinate despair, of stupid insensibility, or of superstitious phrenzy* †.”—In support of the above, he appeals first to a passage of Epictetus, where mention is made of the Galilæans ‡; but adds, “ there is some doubt whether Epictetus alludes to the Christians.” He afterwards cites the testimony of Marcus Antoninus §.

* c. xv. note 136. c. xvi. notes 110. 113, &c.

† Page 552.

‡ Note 94. c. xv. Epictetus, l. iv. c. 7.

§ Marcus Antoninus, l. xi. c. 3.

Mr. G. himself considers this observation of Epictetus as relating to the Christians*; I shall therefore proceed to shew, that the philosopher does not make their conduct the result of such motives as are here represented. For, in this chapter, "*on intrepidity*," he says, "those persons are capable of it who are either insensible of their danger, or involved in calamity; or those who have acquired an indifference to every thing in life:" Then he adds the particular sentence alluded to by Mr. G. which I shall give in the translation of Lardner.—"Is it possible that a man may arrive at this temper, and become indifferent to those things, from *madness*, or from *habit*, as the *Galileans*? And yet that no one should be able to know, by reason and demonstration, that God made all things in the world †?"

The philosopher here accounts for the *indifference* of the Galileans, as if it were *the effect of HABIT*. He could not speak of *their intrepidity* as the effect

* Dr. Lardner—Testimonies, vol. ii. p. 102; 3. speaks of this passage of Epictetus, as relating to the Christians.

"Some have thought, that by Galileans, are here meant the followers of Judas of Galilee. I should rather think, that Christians are intended: of whose sufferings there are such accounts in Tacitus and Suetonius, as may assure us, that Epictetus and Arrian could not be unacquainted with them. The followers of Judas of Galilee were extinct before this time."

† Epictetus, l. iv. Arriani, (8v3 edit. Cantab) c. 7. Περὶ ἀφορίας.

P. 399. ἂν τις οὖν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κτῆσιν ὡσαύτως ἔχη καδάρειν ὅτος (i. e. indifferens) πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, καὶ πρὸς τὰ τέκνα, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἀπὸ τίνος μαρίας, καὶ ἀπονοίας ὅτως ἡ διακείμενος, ὡς ἰν μηδὲν ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ἔχειν, ταῦτα ἢ μὴ ἔχειν——ποῖος ἐστὶ τούτω τύραννος φοβερός; ἢ ποῖοι δρευφόροι; ἢ ποῖαι μάχαιραι αὐτῶν; ἔτι ΤΥΠΟ ΜΑΝΙΑΣ· μὲν δυνατόν τις ὅτω διατείνειν πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ΤΥΠΟ ἙΘΟΥΣ Οἱ ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΟΙ· ὑπὸ λόγῳ δὲ καὶ ἀποδείξεως ὡδαίς δυνατόν μαθῆναι, ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοῦ πάντα πεποινηκε τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

of madness; for he expressly says, that it arose from *their peculiar mode of life*. I appeal to the learned reader, if Epictetus does not make a proper distinction, "Some," says he, "are intrepid through *madness*, some acquire this indifference by *custom*, as the Galilæans." Our very candid author conceals from us that any such distinction is here made; in order, no doubt, to have a pretence for giving us, on the venerable authority of the stoic, a sentiment hatched in his own infidel school, that to be a Christian and to be mad, are synonymous expressions.

Mr. G. has also quoted the authority of Marcus Antoninus on this occasion *. But he does not appear to me to have faithfully translated the phrase of that author. Causabon very accurately renders it, "*not merely through obstinacy*†." But I appeal to the learned reader, whether Mr. G. could, with any shadow of truth, give us, as the expressions of Antoninus, his strange mixture of "*obstinate despair*, stupid insensibility, or superstitious phrenzy?"

It is not indeed easy to say, what idea we can conceive of such *different affections*, as those of *obstinacy* and of *despair conjointly*: It is like our author's causing the same objects, at the same time, to "*excite*" the benevolence of "*compassion*," and the arrogance of "*contempt* §." These pompous, but unmeaning words, which, I will suppose, Mr. G. introduced for no other reason but to round his period; his tribe of admirers, who believe every

* Marcus Antoninus, l. xi. c. 3.

μη κατὰ φίλιν παρὰταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί.

† "*Non ex simplici obstinatione.*" Causabon.

§ Page 538.

thing but what is contained in the Bible, will, no doubt, adopt as the genuine expressions of the philosophic emperor.

I would observe also, the strange inconsistency of our historian on this subject.—We have just read what he says in this place; that “the behaviour of the Christians was too remarkable to escape the notice of the ancient philosophers:” He before spoke “of the supine inattention of these philosophers to Christianity *; and of their rejecting it.” He tells us also, “of the careless indifference which the most copious, and the most minute of the pagan writers, have shewn to the affairs of the Christians †.”

Yet after all, he informs us again, that “the philosophers, who now assumed the unworthy office of directing the blind zeal of persecution, had diligently studied the nature and genius of the Christian religion ‡.”

Misrepresentation of PLINY.

Our author says, “Some of these apostates had yielded on the first menace or exhortation of the magistrate; whilst the patience of others had been subdued by the length and repetition of tortures. The affrighted countenances of some betrayed their inward remorse; while others approached with confidence and alacrity to the altars of the Gods §.”

For this the first authority he quotes is Pliny's Epistles, x. 97 ||. But *Pliny has not particularized that difference of conduct* which Mr. G. here de-

* Page 516, 517.

† Page 530.

‡ Page 530.

§ Page 554.

|| Note 101. c. xvi.

scribes* : Yet his name stands at the head of those authors whom he has cited on the occasion. It is allowed indeed, that this distinction is made by the other authors; but as Pliny, the first referred to by Mr. G., gives him no cause or reason to use them; it is certainly very reprehensible in our author, thus to confound their testimony, and to make a needless and improper reference.

Misrepresentation of OROSIUS †.

Our author, after speaking of the fire of Rome, says, “ the vigilance of government appears not to have neglected any of the precautions, which might alleviate the sense of so dreadful a calamity. *The Imperial gardens were thrown open to the distressed multitude,* temporary buildings were erected for their accommodation, and a plentiful supply of corn and provisions *was distributed at a very moderate price,*” &c. And again, “ But all the *prudence and humanity* of Nero were insufficient to preserve him from the popular suspicion, as having been the incendiary of his own capital ‡.”

Not one of the several authors quoted by Mr. G. on this occasion, give him the least foundation for ascribing the virtues of *prudence* and *humanity* to the abandoned Nero §. But why Orosius should be

* I need not quote the passage from the original, as it is so well known to every admirer of the classics.

† Though this writer was a Christian priest, and a disciple of St. Austin; yet, being best known as a compiler of history, and, as such, cited by M. G. this induced me not to insert this instance of misrepresentation, amongst those of the Fathers.

‡ Page 532

§ Impartiality requires us to inform the reader, that Mr. G. has paid that deference to the general sense of mankind, and the

be appealed to *, is indeed wonderful ; for, excepting the single fact of there having been such a fire, there is the most express disagreement between the circumstances related by this author, and those produced by Mr. Gibbon.

Orosius gives this dark character of Nero :
 “ That he not only equalled, but surpassed, his
 “ uncle Caligula in every vice and crime ; dis-
 “ graced by petulance, lust, luxury, avarice, cru-
 “ elty, and every wickedness.—He adopts the
 “ story likewise of his playing on his harp at the
 “ sad catastrophe ;” and adds, “ *so unbounded was*
 “ *his avarice* that, after the fire was extinguished,
 “ *he would permit no one to go to his few goods which*
 “ *remained ; but he himself caused, whatever the*
 “ *flames had spared, to be carried away †.*”

the authority of history, as to make the following alteration in his third edition : “ But all the prudence and humanity
 “ *affected by Nero on this occasion, was insufficient to pre-*
 “ *serve him from the popular suspicion.*” (P. 637. 3d. edit.)

This correction was indeed necessary, to avoid a striking inconsistency with what immediately follows ; for, otherwise, how could Mr. Gibbon call him *humane* whom he admits to be “ the assassin of his wife and mother ?” O how could that person “ be deemed incapable of the most extravagant folly, “ who,” as he tells us, “ prostituted his person and dignity “ on the theatre ?”

* Note 28. c. xvi. Orosius, vii. 7.

† P. 470, 471. “ Cui Caligulae avunculi sui erga omnia
 “ vitia ac scelera sectator, immo transgressor. petulantiam, li-
 “ bidinem, luxuriam, avaritiam, crudelitatem, nullo non scelere
 “ exercuit, &c.

“ Quod” (scil. incendium Romæ) “ ipse ex altissima illa
 “ Mæcenatiana turre prospectans, lætusque flammæ (ut aie-
 “ bat) pulchritudine, tragico habitu illadem decantabat.
 “ Avaritiæ autem tam præruptæ existit, ut post hoc incen-
 “ dium urbis, quam se Augustus ex lateritia marmoream red-
 “ didisse iactaverat, *neminem ad reliquias rerum suarum adire*
 “ *permiserit, cuncta quæ flammæ quoquo modo superjuerant, ipse*
 “ *abstulit.*” 4to edit. Havercamp. 1738.

I now

I now appeal to the reader, if he really thinks Mr. G. would have cited Orosius, at a place where he is endeavouring to whitewash the character of Nero, if he had ever looked into that author.

Misrepresentation of BAYLE and FABRICIUS.

Our author says, "Notwithstanding it is probable that Tacitus was born some years before the fire of Rome, he could derive only from reading and conversation, the knowledge of an event which happened during his infancy, &c*."

These words he supports by an appeal to the following authors in this note: "See the lives of Tacitus by Lipsius, and the Abbé de la Bletterie, Dictionnaire de Bayle à l'article TACITE, and Fabricius Biblioth. Latin." (tom ii. p. 386. edit. Ernest †.)

Mr. G. has here quoted four authors, as concurring to establish his assertion; whereas they vary in their sentiments. "Bayle reproves Lipsius, and his method of computing the age of Tacitus ‡." And *Fabricius* does not all treat of the time of Tacitus's birth; "but after mentioning his family and descent, proceeds to speak of the order of his work §."

It is plain, therefore, that Mr. G., with the view of displaying extensive reading, has heaped toge-

* Page 535.

† Note 36. c. xvi.

‡ "J'aurai quelques fautes à reprocher à Juste Lipse."

"Il nous apprend qu'il a deterré à peu-près l'année natale de Tacite, &c. Bayle, tom. ii. partie ii. p. 1117. *Tacite*, Not. H.

§ "Cornelius Tacitus, eques Romanus, gener Cn. Julii Agricolaë, sub Vespasiano procurator Galliaë Belgicaë, &c." Fabricius, tom. ii. p. 386. edit. Ernest.

ther quotations as corroborating the same fact, which, when examined, are found to differ very widely.

Misrepresentations of GROTIUS.

I.

The words of Mr. G. relative to this author are emphatical,—“ The learned Grotius,” says he, “ *ventures to insinuate, that, FOR WISE PURPOSES, THE PIOUS DECEPTION*” (namely, of the Millennium, and of the approaching end of the world) “ *was permitted to take place* *.”

I now venture to affirm, that our author has little reason for giving us this as an *insinuation* of Grotius. Though for a good and weighty reason he has not thought proper to guide us by a reference to any particular book, chapter, or page; yet I have been able to trace *the opinion of Grotius concerning the Millennium*, which will be sufficient to convince my reader how *groundless* the words of Mr. G. are.

Grotius, in his comment on St. Luke's gospel, speaks thus on the above subject:—“ And indeed “ partly from the prophecies which I have spoken “ of, partly from the prerogative of the martyrs “ in the resurrection, the opinion of the Millennium seems to have been framed, which, as received from the successors of the apostles, Justin “ and Irenæus, authors of great character, defend; who were followed by Melito, Apollinarius, Tertullian, Victorinus: *Whose opinion, though “ it appears to be intermixed with some human error, “ (since they do not all explain that felicity in the*

* Note 59. c. xv.

" same manner) yet, perhaps, is not totally to be rejected *."

Grotius here speaks a very different language from what Mr. G. has represented it: *He does not venture to insinuate* that this doctrine of the Millennium *was a pious deception*. What apology then can our author make, for fathering a sentiment of his own on an eminent writer, who really does not espouse it? As this is the case, we cannot surely doubt, but that the fear of detection prompted our author not to specify the passage by any particular reference.

But I may now *venture to insinuate*, in his own words, that, though his *purpose was wise*, the *deception*, which can hardly be called a *pious one*, *was not permitted to take place*.

II.

" The fervour of the first proselytes," says Mr. G. " prompted them to sell those worldly possessions which they despised, to lay the price of them at the feet of the apostles, and to content themselves with receiving an equal share out of the general distribution †."

* " Et sane partim ex his quæ dixi vaticiniis, partim ex prærogativa martyrum in resurrectione concinnata videtur sententia illa de mille annorum felicitate, quam ut ab apostolorum successoribus acceptam tuerentur magni Auctores Justinus et Irenæus, quos secuti sunt Melito, Apollinaris, Tertullianus, Victorinus: *quorum opinio, quanquam admittum aliquid habere videtur humani erroris* (quando non omnes illam felicitatem pari modo explicant) *forte tamen non in totum repudianda est.*" Luc. cap. xxi. ver. 24. vol. ii. p. 446.

† Page 495.

He

He confirms this, by appealing in a note * to the Acts of the Apostles, c. ii. 4, 5. with Grotius's commentary.

So far indeed the testimony, which he cites, confirms his assertion; but for the words which immediately follow in his history, he has neither the authority of Scripture, nor that of Grotius. Mr. G. thus proceeds, "when the progress of the Christian religion relaxed, and gradually abolished this generous institution, the converts who embraced the new religion were *permitted* to retain the possession of their patrimony."

The insinuation contained in the last passage is what I would particularly point out, as most opposite to the sentiment of Grotius: For though he speaks of a *general distribution* in his comment, yet he is far from asserting that there was any OBLIGATION on the first proselytes to sell their worldly possessions: and, therefore, NO PERMISSIVE DISPENSATION was necessary. The translation of his words is this:

"WHILE IT REMAINED, WAS IT NOT THINE OWN? It was *not* required of thee by us to sell thine estate, but thou mightest have retained thy property. AND WHEN SOLD IT WAS STILL IN THY POWER. To wit, *the price*: Even after thou hadst sold thine estate, it was lawful for thee to keep the whole price, and dedicate nothing of it to God †."

This

* Note 128. c. xv.

† Act. v. 4. Οὐχὶ μένει σοι ἱμῶν. "Nonne manens tibi manebat."]

"Licebat tibi per nos non vendere prædium, et ejus proprietatem retinere."

This sentiment is so directly the reverse of Mr. G.'s, that it must overthrow what he has said. But it is his usual crafty evasion, to cite the testimony of some great writer on a trifling and indifferent point, and then to extend it to a material reflection, which he takes care to make soon after. So, in this case, Grotius may give him authority for saying, that "the Christians who sold their possessions were content with receiving an equal share out of the general distribution:" Yet, as we have seen, he gives him not the least shadow of a pretext for making the following assertion: That, "when the progress of the Christian religion relaxed—the converts who embraced the new religion were PERMITTED to retain the possession of their patrimony."

But though Grotius does not give Mr. G. authority for his remark, it is still very consistent with his plan of accounting for the rapid progress of the gospel, by secondary causes; as *he considers the general distribution of goods, adopted by the first Christians, as "an institution which MATERIALLY conducted to the progress of Christianity."* And, "that the prospect of immediate relief, and of future protection, allured into its hospitable bosom, many of those unhappy persons whom the neglect of the world would have abandoned to the miseries of want, of sickness, and of old age *."

For, if this was the case, it was certainly great policy, in them, *not to PERMIT the new converts to RETAIN their possessions*, but to make this general distribution, till Christianity had made some consi-

Καὶ πρῶτον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐκκλῆσιᾳ πάντες;

"*Et venerationem in tua erat potestate.*"] "*Nempe i tuum*
 " (pretium.) Etiam postquam vendideras fundum, pretium totum
 " retinere tibi licebat, ac de eo nihil Deo vovere."

* Page 498.

derable

derable progress: It is in this view, I suppose, Mr. G. added the misrepresentation of Mosheim's opinion, in these words of his note:

" Mosheim in a particular dissertation attacks the common opinion with very inconclusive arguments *."

The *most common opinion*, which the learned Mosheim attacks in this dissertation, is Mr. Gibbon's; namely, *that the community of goods was a chief cause of the rapid progress of CHRISTIANITY*. This opinion, *common enough*, indeed, among *infidels*, he does attack; but with arguments, which I must beg leave to call, in deference to our author's superior judgment, *very conclusive*. His words, on this occasion, are as follow †:

" What St. Luke has written of the first church of Jerusalem, *that there was no poor in it*, might be truly said of *all the families of the primitive Christians*. Since, as they were all upon an equality, and acknowledged each other as brethren; it was a *necessary consequence*, that they should suffer *no one* to be in want of those things which life requires: But that they would supply out of their abundance, in a humane and friendly manner, what some stood in need of. *This beneficence of the first Christians towards their poor*, MANY IN OUR DAYS, *who, in their own CON- CENTS, far exceed all other persons in discernment, have blemished with a suspicion of IMPRUDENCE; asserting, that the Christians, by this liberality, sup-*

* Note 128. c. xv.

† As I find the same sentiment, on this subject, expressed in a concise and forcible manner in his history, which he has more copiously treated in his dissertation; I doubt not, but it will be a sufficient apology for my having adopted his words there expressed, in preference to a prolix quotation from his dissertation.

“ *plied the means of idleness and pleasure: They add*
 “ *also, that this great care of the Christians towards*
 “ *the poor, should be ranked as one of THE CHIEF*
 “ *CAUSES of the QUICK PROPAGATION of the Chris-*
 “ *tian religion. For, say they, men addicted to*
 “ *loth, impatient of labour, given up to pleasures,*
 “ *flocked in great numbers to the Christians, that*
 “ *they might live in a convenient and sumptuous*
 “ *manner, without toil and anxiety, on the offerings*
 “ *of the new converts. But it is astonishing, that*
 “ *this should be said by men who wish to appear, in*
 “ *the eyes of the world, as PERSONS ACQUAINTED*
 “ *WITH THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLES, which*
 “ *are extant: Which, if they had EVER read over*
 “ *WITH ATTENTION, they could not be ignorant, that*
 “ *the liberality of the Christians to their poor, was*
 “ *guarded by the most wise laws, lest the church*
 “ *should suffer any detriment, or feel the least in-*
 “ *convenience from it.”*

He then appeals to the second epistle of St. Paul
 to the Thessalonians, c. iii. v. 6—12. and 1 Timo-
 thy, v. 3. 16. and having descanted on these pas-
 sages, mentions other regulations respecting the
 poor*.

I may

* “ Quod de principe omnium ecclesia Hierosolymitana
 “ scriptum reliquit LUCA, ACTOR. iv. 34. nullum in ea
 “ pauperem fuisse, id de omnibus primorum Christianorum
 “ familiis verissime dicitur. Quum scilicet omnes pares sese &
 “ fratres agnoscere, necesse erat, ut nullum in rerum, quas
 “ vita poscit hominum, penuria versari paterentur, verum ex
 “ copia sua quod deerat quibusdam amice ac humaniter
 “ suppeditarent. Eam vero veterum Christianorum erga pau-
 “ peres beneficentiam inter eos, qui sapientia supra ceteros
 “ eminere sibi videntur, multi hodie in suspicinem IMPRU-
 “ DENTIAE vocant, contendentes, ignavia & voluptatis amori
 “ liberalitate sua Christianos fomenta subjecisse: cui addunt, IN
 “ CAUSIS TAM CELERITER PROPAGATAE religionis Christia-
 “ nae hoc ipsum pauperum studium PRIMO LOCO collocari debere :
 “ homines

I may therefore, surely, with great reason, appeal to every candid reader, whether the *only common opinion* attacked here by Mosheim, is not that espoused by Mr. G.—But, indeed, 'it suited our author's purpose, to represent Mosheim's arguments as *inconclusive*; as he must be conscious, that a fair view of them would have exposed his own false assertion.

I shall now proceed to shew how small, and how trifling, the authority is, which our author really has for his very important remarks on the doctrine of "the condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous among the Pagans." I have already shewn, that the testimony of Tertullian, the only

" homines enim inertes, laboris impatientes, voluptarios, mag-
 " no numero ad Christianos accurrissē, quo cum suis laute, cou-
 " mode, sine labore & curis, ex novorum fratrum muneribus
 " vivere possent. Mirum vero haec dici a viris, qui aposto-
 " lorum, quæ extant, scripta evoluisse VIDERI VOLUNT. Quæ
 " si attente legissent, non ignorarent, liberalitatem Christiano-
 " rum in pauperes sapientissimis legibus septam fuisse; ne quid
 " inde incommodi & detrimēti redundaret in ecclesiā n. Pri-
 " mum disertissima PAULI lege numero pauperum exclude-
 " bantur omnes, qui victum sibi ipse, quum possent, quæ-
 " rere, & laborare nolebant: nec pauperum tantum numero,
 " verum etiam fratrum excludebantur. Omnes item, qui se-
 " cus vivebant, quam decebat CHRISTI discipulos, suas sibi
 " res habere jacebantur & Christianæ caritatis fructu carere.
 " 2 Thess. iii. 6.—12. ——— Alia lege, æque clara & disenta,
 " singulis Christianorum familiis officium imponebatur paupe-
 " res suos alendi, nec permittendi, ut ecclesiæ oneri essent.
 " 1 Tim. v. 3. 16. ——— Altera lege cavebatur, ne mali ho-
 " mines beneficia ecclesiæ in vitiorum alimenta converterent:
 " altera providebatur, ne publicorum pauperum numerus præ-
 " ter modum cresceret & loculos piorum nimis gravaret. Igitur
 " non omnis, cui aut nulla res erat, aut angusta, pauperis no-
 " mine venerando honestabatur in prisca ecclesiā; verum pauper
 " erat vir Dei, hominumque amans, qui nec sua sibi victum in-
 " dustria comparare, nec a necessariis & cognatis opem sperare
 " poterat." Hist. Christian. sæc. i. p. 142. § 45.

Father he quotes, does not tend to corroborate his assertion : My next step is to examine what he adds besides on this subject. " And yet whatever may be the language of individuals, it is still the public doctrine of all the Christian churches. The Jansenists, who have so diligently studied the works of the Fathers, maintain this sentiment with a distinguished zeal ; and the learned M. de Tillemont never dismisses a virtuous emperor without pronouncing his damnation. Zuinglius is the only leader of a party who has ever adopted the milder sentiment, and he gave no less offence to the Lutherans than to the Catholics *."

It is here evident, at first sight, that testimony is produced only for a small part of this *very material note*. The sentiment of Zuinglius is all that we find in Bossuet, at the place referred to. He is here spoken of " as a bold man, of more fire than judgment ;" and though " no one of the reformers explained their thoughts in a manner more precise and uniform ; yet, at the same time, no one carried them to so great a height, nor with more boldness," than Zuinglius. To prove this, Bossuet instances his " admitting into heaven, even the heroes and demi-gods of the Pagan mythology." On which he well observes, that " such notions as these are not to be considered as those flights of imagination which escape men in the heat of argument : For Zuinglius was writing a confession of the faith ; and a plain and precise explanation of the Apostles' creed : A work, the nature of which requires, above all

* Note 68. c. xv. Bossuet Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, l. ii. c. 19.—22.

“ others, a mature consideration, exact doctrine,
“ and settled meaning *.”

The above passage may give some reason for the offence which this doctrine of Zuinglius occasioned. However, I must particularly observe, that no authority is cited to confirm the former *and most material part* of the note, that *this is still the public doctrine of ALL the Christian churches*. Indeed it would have been a hard task for our author to have obtained testimony for the bold assertion. For with the author of the remarks, I dare to say, as a member of the church of England, that *she holds no such doctrine*. We do not presume to set limits to the mercy of God. The light of nature being their guide; by that test, the Scripture informs us, they will be rewarded or condemned—“ For as many

* “ Zuingle Pasteur de Zurich avoit commencé à troubler
“ l'Eglise, à l'occasion des indulgences, aussi-bien que Luther,
“ mais quelques années après. C'estoit un homme hardi, &
“ qui avoit plus de feu que de sçavoir. Il y avoit beaucoup
“ de netteté dans son discours, & aucun des Prétendeurs Ré-
“ formateurs n'a expliqué ses pensées d'une manière plus pré-
“ cise, plus uniforme, & plus suivie : mais aussi aucun ne les
“ a poussées plus loin, ni avec plus de hardiesse. Comme on
“ connoitra mieux le caractère de son esprit par ses sentimens
“ que par mes paroles, je rapporteray un endroit du plus ac-
“ compli de tous ses ouvrages.”

“ C'est la Confession de Foy, qu'il adressa un peu devant sa
“ mort à François I. Là, expliquant l'article de la vie éter-
“ nelle, il dit à ce Prince, qu'il doit espérer de voir l'assem-
“ blée de tout ce qu'il y a eû d'hommes saints, courageux, fi-
“ deles, & vertueux dès le commencement du monde.” &c.

“ Vous y verrez Hercule, Thésée, Socrate, Aristide, An-
“ tigonus, Numa, Camille, les Catons, les Scipions,” &c.

“ Ce n'estoit pas icy de ces traits qui échappent aux hom-
“ mes dans la chaleur du discours : il écrivoit une Confession
“ de Foy, il vouloit faire une explication simple & précise du
“ Symbole des Apotres ; ouvrage d'une nature à demander
“ plus que tous les autres une meûre considération, une doc-
“ trine exacte, & un sens raffiné.” Bossuet Histoire des Va-
“ riations, &c. l. ii. c. 19—22. p. 25. &c. 8vo, edit. à Liege.

“ as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law : And as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law *.”

Misrepresentation of IGNATIUS.

Our author throws out a false accusation against this Father, in the following words :

“ It was impossible,” says he, “ that the Gnostics could receive our present gospels, many parts of which (particularly in the resurrection of Christ) are directly, and, as it might seem, designedly, pointed against their favourite tenets. It is therefore somewhat singular, that † Ignatius should chuse to employ a vague and doubtful tradition, instead of quoting the certain testimony of the evangelists ‡.”

I cannot find any passage, that bears the least similarity to what Mr. G. observes, in the whole epistle, which I have read over more than once. Ignatius advises, on the contrary, “ *to pay particular attention to the prophets, but more ESPECIALLY to the GOSPEL*, in which the passion, of our Lord is made manifest unto us, and his resurrection perfectly demonstrated §.”

* St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, ii. 12. See Whitby, Hammond, Locke, Taylor, &c. See also Bishop Sherlock's Discourse, I. vol. i.

† Epist. ad Smyrn. Patr. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 34.

‡ Note 34. c. xv.

§ Ignatius Epist. ad Smyrnæos.

Ἡροσέχων δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῶν δεδήλωται, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελειωται. p. 4.
 δεστ. V. Ὅτι τινες ἀγνοοῦντες ἀγροῦνται, μᾶλλον δὲ κηρύττειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτις συνήγοροι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας. οὗς οὐκ ἴπικισαν οἱ προφῆται, ὅτι ὁ νόμος Μωσίου, ἀλλ' ὅτι μετὰ τὸ ἔταττε αἶον, ὅτι τὰ κτήνη τῶν κατ' ἀνθρώπου παθόντων. P. 44. edit. Russel.

Again,

Again, he says, " There are some who, being ignorant of Jesus Christ, deny him, or rather have been denied by him, being advocates of his death, rather than of the truth—whom neither the *prophecies*, nor the *law of Moses*, nor even the *gospel have persuaded*, to this time *."

Now with what truth can Ignatius be said to employ a *vague and doubtful tradition*, when he founds the truth of our Saviour's passion and resurrection, on the authority of the prophets and the *evangelists*? May we not then naturally conclude, that if our author had ever looked into this epistle of the Father, which he cites with a parade of learning, he could not have been guilty of so gross a misrepresentation?

Misrepresentation of LE CLERC and MOSHEIM.

I have already given one proof of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting Le Clerc, in treating of the Jewish opinion concerning a future state. I now proceed to another instance of his unfairly stating the opinion of this writer with regard to the epistles of Ignatius.

* I have here adopted the interpretation of the original word *πεισινται*, which the learned Beausobre has given. His explication of the whole passage, and his defence of this Father from the misrepresentation of Mr. Simon, is truly ingenious. It will be hereafter shewn, that a part of this explication probably gave rise to the remark of Mr. G.; but had he fairly represented the whole of it, it would have appeared that St. Ignatius himself complains of those persons who were to particularly fond of *vague and doubtful tradition*, as not to receive the scripture itself without its authority. It must be owned, our historian is *very expert in misrepresentation*. See Beausobre. Hist. de Manichee, &c. tom. i. partie ii. livre ii. ch. vii. § 8. p. 450, &c. 4to edit.

His

His words are, " Ignatius* is fond of exalting
 " the episcopal dignity. *Le Clerc* † *very bluntly*
 " *censures* his conduct."

I shall first observe Mr. G.'s inaccuracy, in referring to chapter iii. of Ignatius's epistle to the Smyrneans, for this subject; whereas he should have appealed to chap. viii. and ix. to which particular chapters *Le Clerc* himself refers, and indeed he is so far from *bluntly censuring his conduct*, that he, on the contrary, is really his advocate; as will plainly appear from these his words:

" Although in the former epistles, except that
 " to the Romans, Ignatius exhorts the Christians
 " to obey the governors of the church, yet on no
 " occasion does he speak of it so earnestly as in this
 " epistle to the Smyrneans."

Le Clerc then quotes the passage, and makes the following observations on it.

" Ignatius was acquainted with the sound doctrine and holy manners of Polycarp, by whom
 " nothing could be said, or done, which was not
 " consonant to the Gospel. If he had been guilty
 " of teaching unsound doctrine or of corrupt
 " morals, or suspected of inconstancy, the bishop
 " of Antioch would never have used such
 " language. After it was found from experience
 " that the Christian bishops, as in the time of Arius,
 " Nestorius, or Eutyches, had deviated from the
 " Gospel both with regard to doctrine and practice,
 " no doubt they, who differed from them in
 " opinion, did not think it was their duty to obey
 " them in all things. *These* (injunctions) therefore
 " *are not to be looked upon*, says *Le Clerc*, *as mathematical axioms, which admit of no exception:*

* Note §11. c. xv. Ignatius ad Smyrnanos, c. 3, &c.

† Hist. Ecclesiast. p. 569.

“ And we may say the same of the other precepts
 “ of Ignatius, which relate to the honour due to
 “ truly Christian bishops*.”

This certainly does not appear like *blunt censure*, but rather friendly construction, and apology; for he first gives the reasons why Ignatius should use this language, and then puts in a necessary restraint, shewing how these precepts were, and should be respected; namely, *as general rules, but not without exception.*

By the above interpretation, an agreement is formed between this and a previous apology, which Le Clerc makes for Ignatius.

* “ Quamvis in superioribus Epistolis, exceptâ eâ quæ ad Romanos data est, Ignatius Christianos ad obsequium erga Rectores Ecclesiæ hortetur; in nulla tam graviter ea de re agit, quàm in hac ad Smyrnicos epistola, ubi sic c. viii. loquitur, “ Omnes episcopum sequimini, ut Jesus Christus Patrem, & Presbyterium, ut Apostolos. Diaconos autem revereamini, ut Dei mandatum” (hoc est, “ Apostolorum ac proinde Dei mandato institutos”) “ Sine Episcopo nemo quidquam eorum, quæ ad Ecclesiam pertinent, faciat. Firma Eucharistia ea habeatur, quæ sub episcopo fuerit, vel quam ipse permiserit. Ubi comparuerit Episcopus, ibi multitudo sit: quemadmodum ubi fuerit Jesus Christus, ibi est Catholica Ecclesia. Nec baptizare, neque agapam celebrare, sine Episcopo licet: sed quicquid ille probaverit, Deo gratum est, ut tatum ratumque sit quicquid agitur.”

“ Norat, nempe Polycarpi sanam doctrinam & sanctos mores; à quo nihil doceri, aut fieri poterat, quod non esset Evangelio consentaneum. Si fuisset pravæ doctrinæ, aut morum minus castigatum reus, aut inconstantiz suspectus, nunquam ita loquutus esset episcopus Antiochenus. Certè postquam Christiani Episcopi, ut temporibus Arii, Nestorii, aut Eutychis, nec doctrinam Evangelicam, nec mores ei consentaneos retinuisse compertum est; iis per omnia obsequi oportere qui aliter sentiebant, non crediderunt. Non sunt ergo hæc instar axiomaticum Mathematicorum, quæ nullâ exceptione laborent, habenda: uti nec sequentia quæ ad verè Christianorum Episcoporum honorem pertinent.”

Hist. Ecclesiast. Sæculum ii. Ann. cxvi. § 29.

“ I am

"*I am surprised,*" says he, "*that this should appear to learned men as difficult to be credited; and, therefore, that the epistles of Ignatius are to be rejected.*" "What if *Irenæus, Epiphanius,* and others, should not have mentioned such men as these, it does not therefore follow that there were none, since these writers themselves are not so very accurate as to make no omissions*."

This must be allowed to be *an apology* even stronger than the former: Therefore Mr. G.'s expression that Le Clerc *bluntly censures* Ignatius, has no other foundation than in his own fancy.

But the MISREPRESENTATION OF MOSHEIM'S opinion on these epistles is still more flagrant. "Mosheim, with a more critical judgment," says he, "suspects the purity even of the smaller epistles" of Ignatius†.

The real case is, Mosheim, at the place cited by Mr. G., tells us, "he knows not which are genuine, but speaks of *some* of the epistles as having an undoubted claim to veracity." His suspecting the purity, even of the smaller epistles, according to Mr. G., seems to imply a total rejection of the larger. Mosheim's words are expressly the reverse, that "the longer epistles are of greater value: *this opinion may be objected to,*" adds he, "*but can never be confuted.*"

* § 28. "Quare miror hoc viris doctis * difficile creditu visum; proptereaque Ignatianus Epistolas esse rejectas. Quod si *Irenæus, Epiphanius,* alique non meminerint ejusmodi hominum, non sequitur propterea nullos fuisse; cum non usque ad id adcurati illi scriptores sint, ut nihil omittant." See also p. 571. § 31.

† Note 111. c. xv.

* Difficile creditu] Vide *Cotelierum* ad hunc locum, &c. *Pearsonium*. Vind. Ignat. P. 2. c. ix.

Again, he says, " Whatever edition we prefer, we shall never be able to remove every corruption and interpolation. In his opinion, therefore, the contest respecting these epistles is not, nor can be determined till other copies be found to throw more light on the subject. That *these epistles are very ancient, it is most certain,*" continues Mosheim, " *and that the whole of them are not forged, is so credible that nothing can be more so:* But how far they ought to be received as genuine, I think is totally inexplicable *."

To prove that it was the constant sentiment of the learned and judicious Mosheim, that the epistles of Ignatius were *not to be rejected*, and that *some of them were genuine*; I shall subjoin this further proof, which he gives in the first volume of his dissertations.

" He desires to know the reasons, for which his opponent deemed the epistles of Ignatius to be spurious and forged. That it materially concerned him, as he had lately made use of the authority of these epistles in writing against To-

* " *Ipse vero quam cum aliis viris doctis communem habent, sententia, longiores epistolas IGNATII majoris æstimandas esse quam breviores, oppugnari quidem. verum omni veri specie nudari & funditus everti, nullo modo potest.*"

" Utiam vero editionem præstare alteri ducamus, nunquam tamen, quicquid etiam conemur, omnem ab his epistolis depravationis & interpolationis suspicionem prorsus amovimus. Meo igitur judicio magna illa lis de Ignatianis epistolis, quæ tot viros egregios exercuit, adhuc sub iudice versatur, neque dirimi poterit, nisi vel plures & antiquiores codices reperiantur, vel alia veterum scriptorum monumenta, quæ lucem disputantibus clariorem præbeant, proterantur. *Antiquissimas esse has epistolas, certissimum est: non totas esse confictas, tam credibile, ut nihil credibilius fieri possit: quatenus vero pro sinceris haberi debeant, id inenodabile arbitror.*"

De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. p. 161.

" *land;*

“ *land*: And had then, after an accurate examination, found *no reason to decline making use of them*; thinking the arguments of *Pearson*, and others, in favour of them, *unsatisfactory*. Wherefore, says he, if you have any thing which will overthrow their authority, do not refuse to communicate it: And if I perceive your arguments to be well grounded, I will expunge every thing I said to corroborate their authority in my former work *.”

We find him also, in a subsequent dissertation, giving it as his judgment, that “ the epistles of Ignatius are of the highest antiquity, as they con-

* “ *Video ex Dissertatione Tua “ de columba ex POLYCAR-
“ ni, regis evolante” omnes IGNATII & POLYCARPI epi-
“ stolas spurias & confictas esse, TE persuasissimum habere.
“ Acta etiam POLYCARPI omnino a TE rejiciuntur. E re-
“ mea est, ut cognoscam, quibus rationibus in hanc inductus
“ sis opinionem. Nuper cum adversus celeberrimum TO-
“ LANDUM antiquæ Christianorum disciplinæ vindiciæ
“ conscriberem, etiam has in auxilium vocavi epistolas, mag-
“ namque demonstrationis partem ope earum contexui. Se-
“ rio in falsitatem & veritatem earum inquirenti nihil tum oc-
“ currebat, quod me a proposito iis utendi dimoveret. PEAR-
“ SONI potius, aliorumque rationes invidias esse opinabar.
“ Sed homines sumus, qui non raro fallimur. Facilius quidem
“ quare aliquid falsum, quam quare verum cernimus; sed &
“ interdum, quum res nostra agitur, nimis celeriter, quare ali-
“ quid verum sit, perspicimus. Quamobrem, VIR AMPLIS-
“ SIME, si quid habes, quod auctoritatem harum epistolarum
“ evertere possit, invidere nobis noli. Omnium interest ut
“ ex illis tandem fluctibus emergamus, quantive hæ epistolæ
“ habendæ sint, cognoscamus. Ego quidem, si rationes TUAS
“ immotas esse conspexero, lætus mentem veterem exuam,
“ omniaque quæ in vindiciis meis chartis illis inoiguntur, ex-
“ pungam. Permanebit veritas, etiam si hæc cadant. Quod
“ si vero labefactari eas haud posse post institutam delibera-
“ tionem intelligere, adversarium me, sed modestum & pacifi-
“ cum, habebis.”*

Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentium, vol. i. De Joanne in fervens oleum conjecto, p. 530, &c. 8vo edit.

“ tain

“ tain traces of that ancient simplicity not to be
“ found in later writers *.”

Nay, we are sure, that he never saw reason to change this opinion. For, when at a more advanced period of his life, he published an edition of his dissertations, with his last corrections, he expressly tells us :

“ Whatever I advanced in my dissertation on
“ St. John’s being cast into the burning cauldron
“ of oil, however juvenile my judgment was,
“ which age has now improved, *I mean to confirm ;*
“ *as I have intentionally made no alterations in it.*
“ Neither do I now perceive, that *I made any mis-*
“ *take, nor do I reject any thing at present, which I*
“ *then embraced †.*” And yet this was the disserta-
tion in which Mosheim gave judgment in favour of
the epistles of Ignatius. Surely now, after all this
accumulation of evidence, Mr. G. will be more
cautious than to say that *Mosheim, with a critical*
judgment, suspects their purity.

Misrepresentation of LE CLERC and MOSHEIM.

There still remains another instance of Mr. G.’s misrepresenting both these authors, as well as Cyprian, on the same subject.

* “ Atque vel hanc propter causam vetustissimas esse judi-
“ co IGNATHII epistolas, quoniam antiquæ hujus simplicita-
“ tis rariora in sequentibus scriptoribus vestigia reperio.” Dis-
sertatio, “ De Gallorum Appellationibus.” § xi. p. 600.

† “ *Intactam & hanc, & precedentem de Johanne in servens*
“ *oleum conjecto Commentatiunculam reddere consulte lectori-*
“ *bus volui, ut quali juvenis fuerim ingenio & quatenus me*
“ *sapientiorem, melioremque ætas fecerit, statueret valeant.*
“ *In univrsam nihil à me peccatum esse, nunc etiam sentio, nec*
“ *quæ olim judicavi, hodie repudio.*”

Addenda ad primum volumen Dissertationum, &c. p. 767.

“ The

"The bishops of Italy, and of the provinces," says he, "were disposed to allow them," (that is, the Roman pontiffs) "a supremacy of order and association (such was their very accurate expression) in the Christian aristocracy *."

He then appeals by note to the following writers: "Irenæus adv. Hæres. iii. 3. Tértullian de Præscriptione, c. 26. and Cyprian. Epistol. 27. 45. 71. 75." To which he adds this remark, "Le Clerc (Hist. Eccles. p. 764.) and Mosheim (p. 238. 578.) labour in the interpretation of these passages. But the loose and rhetorical style of the Fathers often appears favourable to the pretensions of Rome †."

The expression which our author here adopts, that "Le Clerc and Mosheim labour in the interpretation of these passages," seems to imply, that it is with great difficulty they can maintain their point. With how little foundation Mr. G. has laid this, will appear from the following just representation; and it will prove, that *the loose and rhetorical style of the Fathers does NOT so often appear FAVOURABLE to the pretensions of Rome.*

It is remarkable, that neither Le Clerc nor Mosheim *do at all appeal to the authority of Cyprian*, as we should imagine they did from Mr. G.'s words, "they labour in the interpretation of *these passages*;" by which, I suppose, he means *these passages he had just cited*, among which *the greater number* are from Cyprian. But as neither Le Clerc nor Mosheim have cited these passages of Cyprian, let us see what reason Mr. G. had for quoting them.

* Page 494.

† Note 122. c. xv.

He first appeals to epistle 27. which (in the Oxford edition, Fell. *) is addressed to "The *presbyters* and *deacons* of Rome, whom Cyprian only *consults*, asking their assistance against Lucian."

Pamelius' edition, epist. 27. † speaks indeed of the *dignity* of bishops in general, and so may be interpreted of the *see of Rome in particular*, by a person that way inclined. Yet the note says otherwise: "So far was Cyprian from intending these words to be understood of the prerogatives of *the Roman church*; that from hence he grounds and asserts HIS OWN rights, and those of all the other bishops ‡."

However it must not be denied, that some passages in epist. 55, &c. do indeed seem to intimate a *supremacy*.

Yet, in epistle 71, we find Cyprian arguing against it, "For," says he, "Peter himself, whom the Lord first made choice of, and upon whom he built his church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him respecting circumcision, did not insolently claim, or arrogantly assume, any thing to himself, by saying, that he held a supremacy, and ought to be obeyed by younger and succeeding bishops §."

* Mr. G. has specified this particular edition; he ought therefore, for conformity, to adhere to it, at least to inform us when he makes use of another edition.

† Epist. 33. edir, Oxon. Fell.

‡ "Tantum abest ut verba hæc senserit Cyprianus de ecclesiæ Romanæ prerogativis fuisse intelligenda; ut exinde sua et aliorum omnium episcoporum jura stabiliat atque offerat."

§ "Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpt, ut diceret se primatum tenere; et obtemperari à novellis et posteris, sibi potius oportere."

Page 194.

We may therefore conclude, that the passages of Cyprian, to which our author refers us, do not appear favourable to the pretensions of Rome.

The sentiment of the learned Dodwell deserves attention, as he has written many judicious dissertations on the epistles of Cyprian.

He says, " It was impossible that Cyprian could ever have allowed a supremacy; because that very argument which he insists on, and constantly repeats, that every bishop was supreme in his own diocese, was totally inconsistent with the principle of their acknowledging one as the center of union: So that neither the opinion nor the reasoning of Cyprian, is so favourable to the Romanists as they imagine *."

I come now to the arguments of *Le Clerc* †. " There are some who think it manifest," says he, " from

* " Quid quod absoluta illa *episcoporum* in sua cujuscunque diocesi *supremitas* toties à *Cypriano*, inter æstus etiam disputandi, non *agnita* modo sed *asserta* etiam atque *inculcata* non patitur ut eundem existimemus *unum* aliquem inter illos agnovisse *unitatis principium*, à quo utique qui *ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitatem* illibatam vellent, pendere omnino, et decreta ejus agnoscere debuerint. Ita nec *sententiam* habebimus *Cypriani*, nec *ratiocinationem*, ita, quam existimant, *Romanensibus* propitiam," Dodwell. Dissert. Cyprian, p. 175, 176.

† *Le Clerc*. Hist. Ecclesiast. Ann. CLXXX.

Secl. 13. p. 763. " Sunt qui velint ex *Irenæo* constare non aliter sensitte veteres de ecclesiâ, quàm nunc vulgò sentiunt pontificii Romanæque ecclesiæ, è veterum sententia, *primatum*, ut loquuntur, debitum fuisse; ita ut auctoritate eâ polleret, quæ nulli alii inerat ecclesiæ. At veteribus hæreticis, qui scripturæ et apostolorum auctoritatem nihili faciebant, jure opponi poterat consensus ecclesiarum Christianarum, ab apostolis olim conditarum. Verum, non eadem est ratio eorum, qui à ducentis propè annis ab ecclesiâ Romana secesserunt; cum scripturæ et apostolorum auctoritatem fidei suæ unicum fundamentum esse statuunt; nec secessionem fecerint, nisi quia fundamentum illud, quod immotum esse oportuit, labefactum

" ab

" from *Irenæus*, that the fathers were of the same
 " opinion as the present Papists, that a *primacy* is
 " due to the church of Rome; so that it enjoys an
 " authority that is inherent in no other church.
 " But though the consent of the Christian churches,
 " founded long since by the apostles, could be
 " justly

" ab iis, quibus valedixerunt, putabant. Itaque arma quibus
 " nititur *Irenæus* contra veteres hæreticos, in eos, qui hodiè dis-
 " sentiant ab ecclesia Romana, moveri non possunt.

14. " Audiamus vèto *Irenæum*, de Romana ecclesia loquen-
 " tem, prout ejus verba ab interprete barbaro (nam desunt hic
 " prorsus Græca) conversa sunt.

" Quoniam valdè longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium ec-
 " clesiarum numerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ. et
 " omnibus cognitæ, à gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo,
 " Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam, quàm habet ab apo-
 " stolis traditionem et adnunciatam hominibus fidem; per successi-
 " ones episcoporum, pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes; confun-
 " dimus omnes eos, qui quoque modo, vel per sibi placentiam, vel
 " vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præ-
 " terquam oportet, colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter
 " potiorẽ principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam,
 " hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles; in quâ semper ab his, qui
 " sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ ab apostolis traditio.

" In hoc vero loco, plura interpretatione indigent; itaque me-
 " minerimus, oportet, I. Romanam ecclesiam fuisse maximam, an-
 " tiquissimam et notissimam ecclesiarum tantum Occidentalium;
 " omnes enim Asiæ ecclesiæ, quæ annum LXI. quo Romam pri-
 " mum venit Paulus, conditæ fuerant, et præsertim quidem Ie-
 " rosolimitana, et Antiochena, Romanâ antiquiores erant, nec
 " initio minore credentium numero abundabant; ac proinde si
 " ratio tantum antiquitatis habenda sit, eas ecclesias Romanæ
 " fuisse præponendas; sed dixi *Irenæum* de Occidentalibus ec-
 " clesiis loqui videri:—II. confundi in Occidente meritò potuisse
 " homines, qui, repudiatis apostolorum scriptis, novam doctri-
 " nam veluti ore à nescio quibus discipulis Christi aut apostolo-
 " rum acceptam; cum iis opposeretur ecclesiæ Romanæ traditio,
 " quæ minimum tam erat fide digna, quàm obscuri nescio cujus
 " hominis accepta ab iis, ut aiebant, doctrina:—III. Alioqui
 " successionis, inter ipsos rectè sentientes Christianos, rationem
 " tantam habitam non esse, quasi sola esset veritatis argumentum;
 " quod videre licuit in controversia de Paschate, in qua successi-
 " onis Romanæ traditio neque ab Asiaticis ecclesiis, neque ab
 " ipso *Irenæo* audita est.—IV. Pro vocibus *per sibi placentia*, ut

“ justly opposed to the ancient heretics, who paid
 “ no regard to scriptural and apostolic authority ;
 “ yet the same argument does not hold good
 “ against those Christians who separated from the
 “ Roman church near two hundred years ago; be-
 “ cause they fixed on scriptural and apostolic au-

“ habet Codex, quem sequuta est Parisiensis editio, alios ha-
 “ bere (*) *per sibi placentiam*, hoc est, διὰ τὴν αὐτάδην, quod
 “ fortè melius est.—V. *Potiorē principalitatem* videri, ut dixi-
 “ mus in (†) notis ad ann. CLXXIII. 2. esse pro Græcia
 “ *ἡγεμονίᾳ ἀρχαιότητα*; *potiorē antiquitatem*, idque confirmari
 “ elogio ecclesiæ Romanæ; quæ *antiquissima* ab *Irenæo* dicitur;
 “ nimirum ut monuimus in Occidente:—VI. Quod additur *ad*
 “ *hanc necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam*, videri perinde esse
 “ ac, si qua naleretur controversia, consulendam fuisse (‡), non
 “ quasi aliorum Christianorum fidei dominam, sed ut ejus consi-
 “ lium audiretur, conferreturque cum omnium sententiis; quod
 “ contigit in controversia de Paschate, in qua tamen omnibus
 “ ecclesiis eam sequi necesse non fuit:—VII. *Qui sunt undique fi-*
 “ *deles*, esse totius terrarum orbis Christianos, qui vocantur in
 “ sequentibus *qui sunt undique*; dicunturque in omni ecclesiâ,
 “ *conservasse eam*, quæ est *ab apostolis, traditionem*:—VIII. Si
 “ quid sit minus adcuratum, in *Irenæi* rationeinatione, memores
 “ nos esse oportere, patrum argumentationes non esse demon-
 “ strationes mathematicas, quæ semper et per omnia, sine ex-
 “ ceptione ullâ, sunt veræ, sed satis esse aliquo sensu esse veras,
 “ quod et in omnium scriptorum interpretatione observandum
 “ norunt critici.”

(*) Note 19. *Per sibi placentiam.*] Sic barbare vertit interpres vocem Græcam adlatam, ex etymologia, ut solet; nam αὐτάδην est αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἄδων, sibi ipse placens. uno verbo αὐτάδηνος. Vide *Hesychium*, *Suidam*, et Etymologicum magnum.

(†) The note referred to is p. 742. Note 3. *Majorem antiquitatem.* “ *Cro-*
 “ *diderim Irenæum dixisse πρῶτον, aut ἡγεμονίᾳ ἀρχαιότητα, nam principalem*
 “ *vertit aliquoties interpres ἀρχαίον, unde sequitur, ut ἀρχαιότητα, verteret*
 “ *principalitatem*; quia ex Etymologia significata interpretatur passim.”

(‡) Note 21. “ *Consulendam fuisse.*] Quidam volunt dici Romam ivisse Chris-
 “ tianos, negotiorum causâ, quia sedes erat imperii, inter quos *Grabinus*. Sed
 “ eam sententiam bene consultavit *Franc. Feuardentius*, ivisse enim dicuntur
 “ *ad ecclesiam*, non ad Cæsarem; agiturque hæc de ecclesiæ Romanæ dignitate
 “ et auctoritate, quâ fiebat, ut non inviti ei adfuerentur Christiani, in re-
 “ bus dubiis. quamvis non solerent ab eâ jura veluti petere, eique cæco ad-
 “ sensu parere, ut liquet ex controversia hæc memorata.

“ thority

“thority as the only foundation of their faith ;
 “nor would they have separated, if they had not
 “thought that the foundation which ought to be
 “immoveable, had been shaken by those whom
 “they left. The weapons, therefore, which *Ire-*
 “*neus* uses against the ancient heretics, cannot be
 “wielded against those who at present dissent from
 “the church of Rome.”

He then makes several remarks on the passage in *Irenæus*, which I have abridged as much as possible.

Having previously noted, that “we have not
 “the original Greek, but only the *translation* of a
 “rude interpreter ;” he remarks the *obscurity* of
 the passage : And that “the Roman church was
 “the greatest, most ancient, and celebrated of the
 “*western* churches *only* ; for all the Asiatic
 “churches, especially those of *Jerusalem* and *Ant-*
 “*ioch*, were planted before St. Paul first came to
 “Rome ; and therefore, with respect to *antiquity*,
 “claimed a *preference*.”

——“That the orthodox Christians themselves
 “did not look on this argument of succession as
 “*infallible* ; which is manifest in the controversy
 “respecting Easter ; in which the tradition of the
 “Roman succession was *not* heard by the Asiatic
 “churches, nor by *Irenæus* himself.”

That the original Greek words, which are translated *more desirable principality*, might perhaps mean only *more excellent antiquity*, “which agrees
 “with the eulogium of *Irenæus* on the church of
 “Rome, that it was *the most ancient*.”

“That what *Irenæus* adds, “*it is necessary for*
 “*every church to repair to this*,” appears to mean
 “that when a controversy arose, it was to be con-
 “sulted, not as the *mistress of the faith of other Chris-*
 “*tians* ; but that its sentiment might be heard and

“ compared with the opinions of all the rest.
 “ This was the case in the controversy about
 “ Easter, in which, notwithstanding, it was *not*
 “ necessary for the other churches to follow her
 “ sentiment. Lastly, if there are any inaccuracies
 “ in the reasoning of *Irenæus*, we should remember
 “ that the reasonings of the Fathers are not ma-
 “ thematical demonstrations, which are every
 “ where, and always true, without any exception,
 “ but that it is sufficient that they are *true in some*
 “ *sense*; which rule critics know should be observed
 “ in the interpretation of all authors.”

In a note on this passage he justly observes, that
 “ perhaps the ignorant interpreter did not rightly
 “ understand the meaning of *Irenæus*. Perhaps,”
 says he, “ it is a fault of a greater kind, a *WILFUL*
 “ *corruption*, so that we read in *Irenæus* more than
 “ he himself ever wrote *.”

It must then certainly be allowed, that this diffi-
 cult and obscure passage, when cleared up and il-
 lustrated, is *NOT favourable to the pretensions of Rome*.
 And no ingenuous person would construe the skill
 of the critic into a *laboured interpretation*.

The interpretation of this passage of *Irenæus*, by
 Mosheim, is indeed diffuse and minute; but it is
 by no means *wasted or laboured*.

Our learned advocate Mosheim, after speaking
 of the *equality* of the primitive churches, adds,
 that a *preference* was afterwards given to the judg-

* Note 22. “ *Quod et in omnibus.*] Vide hac de re *artis cri-*
ticæ postremam ed. p. ii. sect. 1. cap. iv. 15, & seqq. Ce-
 terum optandum esset locum hunc *Irenæi* Græcè exare, nam
 “ barbarus interpretæ mentem ejus fortè non satis est adsequutus,
 “ et fortè etiam librarii in versione ejus exscribenda peccarunt;
 “ nisi sit hic peccatum *majoris abollæ* ut ille loquitur, quo
 “ factum sit ut legatur in *Irenæo*, quod in eo scriptum non sit.”

ment of the churches founded by the apostles*. In his note he copiously examines the *vain* pretensions of the church of Rome to a *supremacy*, from the authority of the Fathers, more especially of Irenæus and Tertullian; and gives the following reasons for such passages appearing in their writings: As, "first, the dispute between the Gnostics and the orthodox Christians; in which, the latter, to prove the truth and authenticity of their doctrines, appealed to the institutions and precepts of the apostles, preserved with a sacred veneration by their successors. To this reasoning," says he, "the Gnostics could make no other objection than by saying, that the churches which the apostles had founded, had gradually deviated from their tenets; that others, ignorant of the true apostolical doctrine, had forcibly succeeded to the place of the first bishops, instituted by the apostles themselves. Which *Irenæus* foreseeing, shews, that the bishops of the church of Rome, which, for the sake of brevity, he singles out, descended in an uninterrupted series from the apostles; and that their succession was neither disturbed, nor debased, by the intervention of any foreigner, or of any one who swerved from the opinions of the apostles.

"This single observation throws great light on the manner of his disputation; and alone shews, how greatly they err, who at present call in the assistance of *tradition and apostolical succession*, contending that they do it by the example of the first teachers of the church†."

He

* Sæc. ii. § 21.

† "Huic ratiocinationi non aliter occurrere poterant Gnostici, quam dicendo, ecclesias, quas apostoli condiderant, à sententiis

He observes, that “ neither Tertullian, nor Irenæus, assign more authority to the church of Rome, than to other apostolical churches*.”

In Tertullian’s words he speaks of the church of Rome, as “ enjoying a *greater felicity* in being honoured with the particular presence of St. Peter, St. James, and St. John ; but *no pre-eminence*.”

He remarks too, that “ both these writers pass over in silence the *first* of the primitive churches, which was that of *Jerusalem*, the head and chief of all.”

Having thus shewn wherein Irenæus and Tertullian agree, he proceeds to point out wherein they differ. “ The former, Irenæus, bestows *many privileges* on the church of Rome, while the latter, Tertullian, only allows it a *superior happiness*.”

The reason of this diversity in their sentiments he imputes to the many favours Irenæus had received from that church.” The important passage, on which the Romanists lay such stress, which they represent as “ *most galling to all who have shaken off the yoke of the Roman church* ;” and by

“ *sententiis eorum sensim defecisse, atque vi primorum episcoporum ab ipsis apostolis institutorum locum successisse alios veræ disciplinæ apostolicæ ignaros. Quod prævidens IRENÆUS, ostendit, ecclesiæ Romanæ, quam omnium instar esse brevitatibus causa jubet, episcopos non interrupta serie ab apostolis descendere, successionemque eorum nullius hominis peregrini atque a dogmatibus apostolorum devii interventu turbatam et contaminatam esse. Hæc una observatio plurimum lucis huic disputandi rationi affert, solaque ostendit, quantum admittant errorem, qui hodie traditionem et apostolicam successionem in auxilium vocant, seseque exemplo primorum ecclesiæ doctorum hoc facere contendunt.*”

* “ Nullo, quod apertum est, discrimine has ecclesias apostolicas disjungit TERTULLIANUS : *Omnes* eandem auctoritatem et dignitatem tribuit : Romana ecclesia non major ipsi videtur et ad dirimendam litem illam cum Gnosticis potentior *Ephefina, Thessalonicensi, Corinthiaca,*” &c. p. 260.

which "*she esteems herself more eminent than all other churches,*" is contained in the words of Irenæus*.

"It is necessary that every church, that is the faithful, who are every where, should come to this, i. e. the church of Rome, as having a more desirable principality, and as preserving that tradition which is from the apostles†."

On which he remarks ‡, 1st, "The obscurity of what Irenæus means, owing to the ignorance of the

* "Celebre illud, quod apud IRENÆUM est, ecclesiæ Romanæ elogium, quod REN. MASSUETUS "*molestissimum*" dicit esse omnibus, qui "*Romanæ ecclesiæ et catholicæ fidei jugum excusserunt.*" In quo Romani Pontificis amici maximum positum esse censent præsidium potentæ, qua se *supra omnes ecclesias eminere* Rōmanæ putat, &c." p. 261.

† "Postquam IRENÆUS dixerat, se unius Romanæ ecclesiæ ex omnibus Apostolicis auctoritatem ac disciplinam Gnosticis obducere velle, quoniam brevitati studendum sibi esse, hæc subjicit: "*Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam (Romanensem) propter potiorem principitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique, fideles in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.*" Hæc illa verba sunt, quæ tot subtilies & laboriosas disceptationes pepererunt. Atqui hoc potissimum fulcro si nititur jus illud, quod in omnes reliquas Christianorum societates sibi arrogat hodierna ecclesia Romana, meo quidem judicio propius à lapsu remotum est."

‡ "Animadvertamus, ne hoc temere dictum videatur, in universum (I.) sensum verborum IRENÆI prorsus esse obscurum, neque ex Latini parum sciti ac periti interpretis oratione intelligi clare posse, quamvis vis vocabulis illis subjecta sit, ex quibus sententia totius enuntiati pendet. Quid, quæso est *potior principitas*? Quid sibi vult hæc formula; *Convenire ad ecclesiam Romanam*? Frustra litigamus de sententia hujus loci, dum GRÆCUS IRENÆUS aliquando in lucem proferatur. (II.) Agere IRENÆUM de illa, quæ docere poterat, omnes episcopos & doctores suos in illa disciplina, quam PETRUS & PAULUS tradiderunt, permanuisse."

"Hoc igitur ad hodiernam ecclesiam Romanam trahere velle, idem profecto est, ac si quis Imperatorum Germanicorum, qui Romani etiam nominantur, jura ac potestatem ex

"OCTAVII,

“ the Latin translator; so that,” says he, “ it is
 “ in vain to contend about the purport of this
 “ passage, till the Greek words of *Irenæus* can be
 “ produced.”

2dly.

“ OCTAVII, AUGUSTI, TIBERII, CALIGULÆ, CLAUDII,
 “ primorum ex Augusta Familia Imperatorem Romanorum
 “ juribus & rebus gestis demonstrare velit. Bellum vero homi-
 “ nem & festivum, qui SVETONII quendam aut TACITI
 “ locum de AUGUSTI aut TIBERII auctoritate producat, at-
 “ que constare ex illo disputet qua fide erga FRANCISCUM I.
 “ Germanorum hodie principes esse oporteat? Quod huic ho-
 “ mini juris publici consulti respondebant, id nos illi, qui ex
 “ IRENÆI loco cognosci posse censeat, quam potestate
 “ BENEDICTUS XIV. Pontifex maximus Romanus prædictus
 “ sit.”

III. “ Privati hominis hoc testimonium esse, exilis cujusdam
 “ & ante paucos annos natæ in Gallia ecclesiæ episcopi, homi-
 “ nis præterea, qui non pauca in libris suis edidit documenta
 “ rationis parum purgatæ, mentisque in disputando non satis
 “ sibi relicta. Ecquis vero statuatur vir prudens & rerum perit-
 “ tus, ex privatorum hominum dictis & præceptis, & quod
 “ majus est, ex hominum parum consideratorum, errorisque
 “ non unius convictorum sententiis & judiciis jura rerum publi-
 “ carum & ecclesiarum publica metienda & demonstranda esse?
 “ Justum vero si quis hoc esse velit, habemus qui cum IRENÆO
 “ conferri potest, hominem judicio & ingenio illo non inferio-
 “ rem TERTULLIANUM, qui negat, *ulla re alia, quam felici-
 “ tate*, Romanam ecclesiam reliquis excellentiorem esse. Quod
 “ igitur auctoritate IRENÆI Romanæ Ecclesiæ clientem affirma-
 “ bun’, id nos TERTULLIANI auctoritate negabimus.”

“ Nunc attentius inspiciamus IRENÆI verba. Ait ille;
 “ *Necesse est omnem ecclesiam convenire ad ecclesiam Romanam.*”
 “ idque binas propter causas: Primum, “ *propter potiorum*
 “ *principalitatem.*” Deinde, “ *Quia semper in ea conservata*
 “ *est apostolorum traditio.*” Præcepti ipsius quænam sit sen-
 “ tentia, non satis liquet. Veri tamen simillimum est: “ con-
 “ venire ad ecclesiam Romanam,” idem esse, quod: *accedere*
 “ *ad Romanam ecclesiam*, seu *consultare* ecclesiam Romanam,
 “ atque IRENÆUM hoc dicere velle; Christianos omnes in re-
 “ bus dubiis ad religionem pertinentibus explorare debere sen-
 “ tentiam ecclesiæ Romanæ, & illius quidem, quæ tum exta-
 “ bat, eo quod omnium ecclesiarum occidentis *antiquissima,*
 “ *maxima, & ab Apostolis fundata esset.* Hæc si sancti ho-

“ minis

20th, 'He says, "Irenæus treats of that church of Rome which existed in the *second century*; and which *could assert, that all its bishops and doctors had continued in the discipline of PETER and PAUL*. But to transfer this to the *modern church of Rome*, is the same as if the emperors of Germany, merely because they call themselves *Roman emperors*, should endeavour to assume the rights and powers of *Octavius or Tiberius*. And it would be extremely ridiculous if any

minis mens est, esse vero. adjectæ rationes demonstrant fæc, nihil certe in ea est, quod Romanam ecclesiam valde juvet. Nunquam vero vel subtilissimus disputator efficiet, de ecclesia Romana omnium ætatum & temporum, IRENÆUM verba sua intelligi voluisse. Nos e contrario ex posteriori rationum, quibus scitum suum firmat, probare solide possumus, eum de antiquiori tantum & prima de ætatis suæ ecclesia, Romana loqui. Dicit enim, ideo veniendum esse ad ecclesiam Romanam, quia, "in ea traditio Apostolorum conservata est." De præterito tempore clare differit. Si ecclesiam Romanam omnium ætatum audiendam esse putasset, scripsisset: in qua traditio apostolorum conservata est, *et semper conservabitur*. Prior vero ratio, quam in potiore principalitate ponit luce prorsus & evidentiâ caret. *Principalitatis* enim vocabulum quum ambiguum sit & ad complures res accommodari queat, IRENÆUS vero, saltem Latinus interpres ejus, non indicet, quodnam "*principalitatis*" genus intelligat, tota ejus sententiâ in tenebris jacet. Ego quidem arbitror, "*principalitatis*" nomine, IRENÆUM quatuor illa decora ecclesiæ Romanæ, quæ paullo antea enumeraverat, significare, magnitudinem, antiquitatem, celebritatem, origines Apostolicas: *Maximæ*," inquit, "*et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis, Petro et Paulo, fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ*." Hæc est potior illa, quam prædicat, *principalitatis* Romanæ ecclesiæ; de alia ejus ætate non cogitabatur. Saltem hæc verborum ejus explicatio tantum habet firmitatis & evidentiæ, quantum nulla habet alia. Verum desino, alia licet in promptu fiat, quæ monere possim. Dedecet profecto viros eruditos & sapientes, ex verbis obscuris & incertis privati hominis & unius pusillæ ac pauperis ecclesiæ episcopi, boni quidem & pii, verum mediocri acumine ac ingenio præditi; jus publicum totius ecclesiæ Christianæ atque formam gubernationis ejus a CHRISTO præscriptam elicere."

" writer

“ writer should produce a particular passage from
 “ SÜETONIUS or TACITUS respecting the authority
 “ of AUGUSTUS or TIBERIUS ; and argue, that from
 “ thence it is evident, what allegiance the present
 “ princes of Germany should give to FRANCIS I.
 “ The same reply that the lawyers would make to
 “ such a person, do we make to those who think it
 “ may be ascertained from a passage of *Irenæus*,
 “ on what grounds the authority of the present
 “ pope is founded.”

He, 3dly, observes, That “ this is but the testi-
 “ mony of an individual, and of one who, from
 “ his writings, appears to have been ill qualified
 “ for controversy, and of moderate abilities. But
 “ what prudent man could imagine, that the *pub-*
 “ *lic* rights of states and churches are to be mea-
 “ sured, or proved, by the words or injunctions of
 “ *individuals* ; especially of those who have been
 “ convicted of more than one error in their judg-
 “ ments & But if any one should deem this equita-
 “ ble, we have one who may be compared with
 “ Irenæus, I mean *Tertullian*, a man *not inferior* to
 “ him in judgment or understanding ; who *denies*
 “ *that the church of Rome is more excellent than*
 “ *others in any thing but felicity*. What, there-
 “ fore, the advocates of the church of Rome shall
 “ affirm on the authority of *Irenæus*, that will we
 “ deny on the authority of *Tertullian*.”

Let us now more attentively consider the words
 of *Irenæus* —“ *To meet or go to the church of*
 “ *Rome*, is the same as to *consult* it, and *Irenæus*
 “ means to say, that *all* Christians, in doubtful
 “ cases relating to religion, ought to enquire what
 “ is the opinion of the Roman church, as it *then*
 “ existed ; because it was the greatest and most an-
 “ cient of the western churches, and founded by
 “ the apostles.—If this is the meaning of the holy
 “ man, and that it is, the reasons annexed prove
 “ almost

“ almost to a demonstration, there *is nothing* which
 “ can be of such *great assistance* to the church of
 “ Rome: Nor will the most subtile disputant ever
 “ make it out, that *Irenæus* intended his words to
 “ be understood of the church of Rome *of all ages*.
 “ We, on the contrary, *can evidently prove* from
 “ the latter reason he gives for his opinion, that he
 “ speaks *only* of the ancient and first *church of Rome*
 “ *of his time*. For, he says, we are to repair to
 “ the church of Rome, because the tradition of the
 “ apostles *has ever been preserved in it*. He clear-
 “ ly speaks of the *past* time. If he had thought
 “ that the church of Rome of *all* times should be
 “ heard, he would have written, in which the tra-
 “ dition of the apostles *has been, and ever will be*
 “ *preserved*.”

With respect to his first reason, “ *a more desire-*
 “ *able principality*, it is totally obscure. For the
 “ word *principality*, being applicable to so many
 “ things, its ambiguity involves the sentence in
 “ impenetrable darkness.—I am of opinion, that
 “ by this word *Irenæus* signifies the four great or-
 “ naments of the church of Rome, its *magnitude*,
 “ *antiquity*, *celebrity*, and *apostolical origin*: the
 “ which he had just before enumerated. Neither
 “ did he think of any future state of it. At least
 “ *this* interpretation has *more evidence* than *any*
 “ *other*: I desist, therefore, though other argu-
 “ ments are at hand, *It is a disgrace certainly to*
 “ *wise and learned men, to found the public preroga-*
 “ *tive of the whole Christian church, and the form*
 “ *of its government, prescribed by Christ himself,*
 “ *on the obscure and doubtful words of a private*
 “ *man; and who, though a good and pious bishop*
 “ *of one poor small church, yet was endowed with*
 “ *a moderate share of discernment and judgment*.”

I hope my reader is now convinced, that *the loose*
and rhetorical stile of the Fathers, thus cleared up
 and

and explained, does *not appear so favourable to the pretensions of Rome as Mr. G. would persuade us.*

I have dwelt long on this point. But a Protestant, writing principally to Protestants, could not omit this confutation of Mr. G.'s insinuation in favour of the pretensions of Rome: And I shall leave it to himself, or to others, to account for this strange and unnatural alliance of infidelity and superstitiousness, and for his more than once becoming the advocate of Popery, while he is attacking Christianity.

I have already given three instances of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting Mosheim on subjects in which other authors received the same ill treatment: I come now to a fourth instance, in which this writer alone is concerned.

IV.

After passing some encomiums on his favourite divine Dr. Middleton, our historian endeavours to traduce the *just* character which Mosheim gives of him, by styling it *indignation*.

"From the indignation of Mosheim," says he, " (against Middleton) we may discover the sentiment of the Lutheran divines*."

This representation does not lead us to expect the words of Mosheim to be so *impartial and free from invective*, as the following are;—he says,

"Some years ago there lived a man in England, in other respects of an excellent genius, and endued with a more than common share of learning, named CONYERS MIDDLETON, who, having published a volume sufficiently large, condemned the whole body of Christians of Levity, for giving such easy credit to miracles, and was bold to pronounce all those things to be *false*,

* Note 78. c. xv.

" concerning

“ concerning the extraordinary miracles of the first
 “ ages, and the gifts of the holy spirit; which
 “ have been handed down to us by the testimony
 “ and writings of so many of the ancients.” *A
 Free Enquiry into the miraculous Powers, &c. Lond.*
 1749, in 4to *.

Mosheim also judiciously remarks, that “ the
 “ divinity of the Christian religion does not de-
 “ pend on the credit of the miracles, which are
 “ said to be wrought in the *second* and *third* ages;
 “ but is sufficiently established, provided it be cer-
 “ tain that CHRIST and his followers had the
 “ power of changing the laws of nature. But to
 “ a person attentively reading the learned author’s
 “ treatise it is manifest, that while he seems only to
 “ aim at *more modern miracles*, he strikes at those of
 “ CHRIST and his apostles; and wishes to over-
 “ throw the credit of all events exceeding the
 “ powers of nature †.”

The candid reader, acquainted with Middleton,
 will not easily discover with Mr. G., any *indigna-
 tion* here expressed. Does not Mosheim allow him
 to have an excellent genius, and uncommon share of

* “ A qui ante aliquot tamen annos inter Britannos extitit
 “ vir alioquin ingenio excellenti, doctrinaque haud vulgari præ-
 “ ditus, CONYERS MIDDLETON, qui satis magno volumine
 “ emissit, universam gentem Christianam levitatis in hac re
 “ condemnavit, omniaque falsa pronuntiare ausus est, quæ tot
 “ veterum ore ac calamo de extraordinariis Spiritus S. donis &
 “ primorum sæculorum miraculis memoriz prodita sunt. “ *A
 Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers,*” &c. Lond. 1749.
 in 4to. Hist. Christian. ante Constant. M. §. v. p. 221.
 not.

† “ Neque enim divinitas Christianæ religionis ex fide mi-
 “ raculorum pender, quæ secundo & tertio facta dicuntur sæ-
 “ culo, sed firmata satis est, modo CHRISTUM, ejusque ami-
 “ cos potestate valuisse naturæ leges mutandi constet. Verum
 “ viri eruditi librum attente legenti peripicuum fit, eum per
 “ latus recentiorum miraculorum, CHRISTI & apostolorum mi-
 “ racula petere, omniumque eventuum naturæ vires exceden-
 “ tium fidem labefactare velle.”

learning?

learning? He gives us merely an account of the treatise, and passes his judgment on it: How just it is, and free from indignation, I leave those to judge who have considered the matter; and who have seen the treatises written against it. But, I suppose, as Mosheim takes off the veil, and lays open the design of this work to the eyes of the world, it might appear as very severe treatment to his admirer and copier Mr. G.

V.

Mr. G. says, "The want of discipline and human learning was supplied by the occasional assistance of the *prophets*; who were called to that function without distinction of age, of sex, or of natural abilities; and who, as often as they felt the divine impulse, poured forth the effusions of the spirit in the assembly of the faithful *."

To this he adds the following note †.

"For the prophets of the primitive church, see Mosheim, *Dissertationes ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, tom. ii. p. 132—208." This author, he appeals to, does not corroborate the whole of what he says respecting the prophets. Mosheim's principal design is to prove, that "the gift of prophecy was not confined to foretelling future events, nor yet to interpreting the scriptures alone," as some understand it; but he is far from *excluding* the assistance of human learning. As a proof of this, I shall lay before my reader only the following passage.

"To profess my opinion freely," says Mosheim, "of those who are stiled *prophets* in the New Testament, I think they were men called and moved by God in an *extraordinary* manner, su-

* Page 488.

† Note 104. c. xv.

“ *pernatually* illuminated, and taught by God, and
 “ excited to deliver the divine will in a public dis-
 “ course, according to the need of the rising Chris-
 “ tian congregation, either for *instruction*, or *ad-*
 “ *vice*, or for *correction*, as most tended to its wel-
 “ fare *.”

In this concise account of his opinion, Mosheim we see takes no notice of a deficiency in *human* learning, which these prophets were to remedy. Neither does he once intimate it through his whole dissertation. His words rather imply, that the Christian congregations had *teachers* in ordinary, whose *capacities* to teach were acquired in the *usual* way †. But Mr. G. would represent the first Christian congregations as entirely *destitute of discipline and human learning*; to agree the better, I should imagine, with the description he has given of *their meanness and ignorance*.

VI.

In this instance, I mean to shew that our author gives only *a part* of Mosheim's opinion with regard to the progress of the Gospel.

“ But neither the belief,” says Mr. G., “ nor
 “ the wishes of the fathers” (in their account of

* “ Hinc illos, qui in Novo Test. Prophetæ appellantur,
 “ ut plane sententiam meam profitear, homines fuisse, opinor,
 “ *extra ordinem* a Deo vocatos & excitatos, supernaturali modo
 “ illuminatos & de voluntate divina edoctos, actosque, ut
 “ eam pro diversa nascentis cœtus Christiani ratione, vel ad
 “ erudiendum, vel ad commonendum, vel ad corrigendum in
 “ publica concione traderent, salutique ejus ita confulerent.”
 Dissert. tom. ii. cap. ii. § 2. p. 165. See also cap. i. § 12. p.
 154. c. ii. § 8. p. 179. § 13. p. 194.

† See St. Paul's epistle to Timothy, c. iv. 13. “ Give at-
 “ tention to *reading*.” This injunction was hardly necessary,
 if “ the *occasional* assistance of the prophets supplied the want of
 “ *human learning*,” as our historian is pleased to assert.

the amazingly extensive progress of the Gospel)
 “ can alter the truth of history. It will still re-
 “ main an undoubted fact, that the barbarians of
 “ Scythia and Germany, who subverted the Ro-
 “ man monarchy, were involved in the darkness
 “ of paganism; and that even the conversion of
 “ Iberia, of Armenia, or of Æthiopia, was not
 “ attempted with any degree of success, till the
 “ scepter was in the hands of an orthodox empe-
 “ ror*.” In support of the above, he refers us
 to “ the fourth century of Mosheim’s history of
 “ the church †.”

The learned historian does indeed observe, that
 “ as *Constantine* and his successors exerted their ut-
 “ most endeavours to enlarge the limits of Christi-
 “ anity, it is no wonder that so many nations, be-
 “ fore barbarous and savage, subjected themselves
 “ to Christ.”

Yet it should be noted also, that he says, in the
 very next sentence, that “ the less as well as greater
 “ Armenia had the light of Christianity brought
 “ to them *not long after its first rise*, is probable
 “ from many circumstances. But the church re-
 “ ceived its form and establishment in this age †.”

Again he adds, “ Part of the Goths, who in-
 “ habited Thracia, Mœsia, and Dacia, had re-

* Page 512.

† Note 176. c. xv.

‡ Institut. Hist. Ecclesiast. sæc. iv. pars i. c. i.

Sect. 19. “ In proferendis civitatis Christianæ finibus, quam
 “ non mediocrem CONSTANTINUS ipse cum filiis & successoribus
 “ collocaret industriam, non mirum est, populos multos, bar-
 “ baros antea & immanes, CHRISTO sese subjecisse.

“ Armeniæ tam minori, quam majori, religionis Christianæ
 “ lucem *non diu post initia* civitatis Christianæ illaram esse, mul-
 “ tis rebus probabile fit. Firmitatem vero & formam hoc demum
 “ saculo ecclesia accepit Armenica.”

“ceived the Christian religion *long before this century*: And *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the council of *Nice* *.”

Mr. G. has plainly adopted but a *part* of Mosheim’s sentiment, while, from his reference, we should imagine he had the authority of that skilful writer for the *whole* of his observation. The partiality of the extract, therefore, is not the only thing blameable. Our author has presumed to *alter the truth of Mosheim’s history*, that he might have an opportunity of contradicting *the belief and wishes of the Fathers* †.

VII.

This partiality seems to be generally adopted by our historian, in his use of Mosheim, as will appear also from this instance :

“The most sceptical criticism,” says he, “is obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus (namely, on Nero’s persecution). The former is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment

* Sect. 21. “Gothorum Thraciam, Mœsiam, Daciam incolentium pars *jam ante hoc sæculum* Christianam religionem receperat: & THEOPHILUS episcopus eorum in Nicæno concilio præsens erat.” This council was assembled by Constantine, A. D. 325.

† I would here point out to my reader, though our censor of the Fathers looks on their testimony as insufficient, nay even as *false*, that the candid Mosheim, to whose authority Mr. G. appeals, admits them, as *unexceptionable witnesses* in this case. He says, “Ad quas sigillatim provincias, vel in orbe Romano, vel extra illum, lux veri cœlestis hoc sæculo primum pervenerit, veterum monumentorum penuria distincte commemorare vetat. Adfunt, qui docent, *testes exceptione superiores*, in universò fere Oriente, inter Germanos, Iberos, Celtas, Britannos, & alios populos Christum pro Deo cultum fuisse.” Tertullianus, Irenæus, &c.

“ which Nero inflicted on the Christians; a sect of
 “ men who embraced a *new* and *criminal* supersti-
 “ tion *.” He then cites, in a note, “ Sueton. in
 “ Nerone, c. 16.” and continues it thus:

“ The epithet of *malefica*, which some sagacious
 “ commentators have translated *magical*, is consi-
 “ dered by the more rational Mosheim as only sy-
 “ nonymous to the *exitiabilis* of Tacitus †.”

Mosheim does not represent these terms as *syno-
 nymous*: He only says, that there might be the
 same reason for each historian to adopt that lan-
 guage †.

The literal interpretation of his words is, “ on
 “ this account,” (that is, “ because the Christians
 “ despised the religion of the Romans, and en-
 “ deavoured to convert men from it; and be-
 “ cause this was prejudicial to the welfare of the
 “ republic, which had a necessary connection with
 “ the religion of Rome”) “ Tacitus reproaches
 “ the Christians with a *hatred for all mankind*: Nor
 “ do I think that he had any other cause for call-
 “ ing the Christian religion *superstitionem exitiabi-*
 “ *lem*; nor Suetonius for stiling it *maleficam* §.

* Page 534.

† Note 34. c. xvi.

‡ The learned Maclaine translates these words thus, “ a poi-
 “ sonous or malignant superstition:” This is rather different from
 the epithet of Mr. G., “ a new and criminal superstition.”

See Maclaine’s translation of Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History,
 vol. i. p. 57. 8vo. edit.

§ “ Hoc illud est,” (nempe, “ quod Christiani publicam rei-
 “ publicæ religionem, cujus summa erat cum forma civitatis
 “ Romanæ necessitudo & conjunctio, contemnebant & detesta-
 “ bantur) quod TACITUS Christianis exprobat, *odium generis*
 “ *humani*: Nec aliunde putem duci debere, cur idem Christia-
 “ norum religionem *superstitionem exitiabilem*, SÜETONIUS au-
 “ tem *maleficam* nominet.” Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. i. pars i.
 c. v. § 6.

From

From these words, Mr. G. cannot prove, that Mosheim looked on these epithets of Suetonius and Tacitus as *synonymous*: And though our author throws out a sneer by calling those persons *sagacious* who differ from him in not adopting the *rational* interpretation of Mosheim; it should be remembered, that the translation, *magical*, has been dignified by the authority of many learned and able men. It should be noted too that Mr. G. guides us by no particular reference; perhaps he would not wish to refer us to a place in Mosheim, where we might read how groundless the reasons were, which each of the historians had for using such language; perhaps it was left we should discover he had *strained* the words of Mosheim, in order to corroborate his assertion.

VIII.

“ The learned Mosheim,” says our advocate for the heathens, “ expresses himself (p. 147. 232.) “ with the highest approbation of Pliny’s moderate and candid temper *.”

In opposition to this we may affirm, that Mosheim does not give his approbation *indiscriminately* of the *whole* conduct of Pliny, as our author has done; but *highly blames and reprovcs* even his letter to the emperor respecting the Christians: For he speaks of it as “ *unjust and quite unbecoming so judicious a man* †.” These can hardly be called with

* Note 56. c. xvi.

† “ PLINIUS scripserat ei (TRAJANO) ipsam Christianorum perseverentiam crimen sibi visam esse morte luendam, tamen si nihil in religione, quam dimittere volebant, desiderari posset. Neque enim dubitabam, qualescunque esset quod faterentur, per-
“ uicaciam certe & inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri.”
K 3 “ Eam

with propriety, *expressions of the bigbest approbation*. He passes also a similar judgment on the answer of Trajan to Pliny, saying, "That he was *guilty of no small fault in adopting the advice of Pliny, and condemning the Christians to death*, who had forsaken the religion of their ancestors, and would not *apostatize* *." In the same strain of *disapprobation* he speaks, in his General Church History, of the *inconsistent* conduct of the Roman magistrates; of their cruel punishments, and the dreadful issue of the popular clamours †. "To these indeed," says he, "the favourable edict of Trajan did set bounds;" yet this very edict caused many Christians to be put to death, even under the best emperors ‡.

How widely different is this language of Moheim from that of the *bigbest approbation*, which our author represents him as bestowing on the governor. Nor does it differ less from Mr. G's encomium on the *moderate* Trajan's answer, which,

"Eam PLINII sententiam, *injustam licet & viro tam perspicaci plane indignam, amplectebatur imperator*, Christianosque propterea non ut homines in Deos & sacra Romana peccantes, verum ut cives mandatis principis parere nolentes puniri jubebat." De rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. p. 234. not.

* "Peccavit quidem in eo non leviter (Trajanus), quod Christianos desertæ majorum religionis convictos & cedere nolentes capiti pœna jussit affici," Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. i. pars i. c. v. § 9.

† See sæc. ii. pars i. c. i. § 2. and c. ii. § 1.

‡ Sæc. 2. "Hæc Trajani lex inter publicas Romani imperii sanctiones relata, hostium Christianorum furori modum quidem ponebat, at efficiebat etiam ut sub *optimis* quoque imperatoribus *multi Christianorum perirent*. Quoties enim aderat, qui accusandi periculum haud formidabat, accusatus vero objectum crimen non diffitebatur; carnifici tradi poterat, si a CHRISTO desciscere nollet. *Constantia* ergo in religione Christiana ex lege Trajani capitale delictum erat."

in his opinion, “ displays not the implacable zeal
 “ of an inquisitor,” but “ discovers as much re-
 “ gard for justice and humanity as could be recon-
 “ ciled with his mistaken notions of religious po-
 “ licy *.”

IX.

Our author assumes to himself the most unaccountable liberty of censuring Mosheim for an assertion which he does not really make. It is thus introduced :

“ The leisure of the two empresses, of his”
 (Diocletian’s) “ wife Prisca, and of Valeria his
 “ daughter, permitted them to listen with more
 “ attention and respect to the truths of Christiani-
 “ ty, which in every age has acknowledged its
 “ important obligations to female devotion †.”

On this passage he makes the following note :
 “ The expression of Lactantius (de M. P. c. 15.)
 “ *sacrificio pollui coegit*,” implies their antecedent
 “ conversion to the faith ; but does not seem to
 “ justify the assertion of Mosheim, (p. 912.) that
 “ *they had been privately baptized ‡.*”

Now the words of Mosheim are simply these :
 “ Prisca, the wife of Diocletian, being *privately*
 “ *initiated* in the Christian religion, had renounced
 “ the worship of the Gods §.” This expression,
 surely, *need not be confined* to the rite of baptism,

* P. 541. This, by the way, is no pleasing picture of the excellence of polytheism, though drawn by the hands of so great a favourer.

† Page 564.

‡ Note 131. c. xvi.

§ “ Præterea uxor ejus, Prisca, *Christianis factis clam initi-
 “ ata*, cultui Deorum renuntiaverat.” De reb. Christian.
 sæc. iv. pars i. c. i. § 1.

and may imply no more than our author's expression, "their antecedent conversion to the faith."

How then could Mr. Gibbon be so presumptuous, as falsely to charge such an eminent man with *unjustifiable assertion*? Besides, his reference to Mosheim does not lead us to discover even the *name of Valeria*. We read only, "The palaces of the emperors themselves were filled with Christians; nor did any one obstruct them in their free and fearless profession of Christianity *." This is speaking only in *general* terms. Much less does the Christian Mosheim give our infidel historian any pretext for inserting that illiberal malignant insinuation, "*Christianity has, in every age, acknowledged its important obligations to FEMALE devotion.*" The remark is truly *contemptible*.

Misrepresentation of DUPIN.

Our author, in treating of the discipline of the primitive church, has strained some passages in Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, to make them coincide with his own expressions. He says, "According to the circumstances, or the number of the guilty, the exercise of the Christian discipline was varied by the discretion of the bishops. The councils of Ancyra and Illiberis were held about the same time, the one in Galatia, the other in Spain; but their respective canons, which are still extant, seem to breathe a very different spirit. The Galatian who, after his baptism, had repeatedly sacrificed to idols, might obtain his pardon by a penance of seven years; and, if he had seduced others, only three years

* "Plena erant imperatorum ipsorum palatia Christianis neque quisquam eos impediēbat, quo minus libere ac sine formidine Christum profiterentur ac colebant." Sæc. iv. § 1.

"more

“ more were added to the term of his exile. But
 “ the unhappy Spaniard, who had committed the
 “ same offence, was deprived of the hope of re-
 “ conciliation, even in the article of death; and
 “ his idolatry was placed at the head of a list of
 “ *seventeen* other crimes, against which a sentence,
 “ no less terrible, was pronounced. Amongst
 “ these *we may distinguish the inexpressible guilt of ca-*
 “ *lumniating* a bishop, a presbyter, or even a dea-
 “ con*.”

In support of this sentence, he appeals to Dupin†; and thereby displays great *inaccuracy*, as well as shameful *misrepresentation*. For though the subject of penance is treated of in Dupin‡, under the life of *St. Pacien*, nearly where Mr. G. refers us; yet none of the particulars, which he specifies, are there mentioned. Instead of *seventeen* only *three or four* capital crimes are distinguished.

Dupin says, of this Father, “ He first distinguishes *sins* from *crimes*: We must not think,” says he, “ that men are obliged to do penance for
 “ an infinite number of small and more trivial
 “ sins:”—And thus, “ having *pardoned* such, if I
 “ may use the expression, there remains a small
 “ number, which it is easy to avoid, and which
 “ he condemns as meriting a severe punishment.”

He makes these crimes relate to “ idolatry, homicide, and adultery. We are to comprehend
 “ under these *three* crimes, their concomitants and

* Page 501.

† Note 146. c. xv. Dupin *Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique*, tom. ii. p. 304—313.

‡ Page 299—311. 8vo. edit. Paris 1687.

It should be observed, that one of Mr. G.'s references, at note 64. c. xv. answers to this edition: We might, therefore, expect that all of them should answer to it.

“ consequences, which are of a wide extent. As
 “ to other sins, they are healed,” says he, “ by
 “ the practice of good works, and their contrary
 “ virtues. But for the three crimes specified, he
 “ recommends public penance in a particular
 “ manner*.”

It is now manifest that there is not a requisite similitude between the account which Dupin gives us, and that cited by our author as from him.

For a proof of the difference between the canons of the councils of Ancyra and Illiberis; between the punishment of the Galatian and Spaniard, for the same offence; on which Mr. G. harangues, he should have referred us to “ the eighth canon of
 “ the council of Ancyra and Neo-Cæsarea †; and
 “ the first canon of Elvira or Illiberis ‡;” instead of the place in Dupin, to which he now *inaccurately* directs us.

But there still remains a more important charge, the misrepresentation he is guilty of in the words which close this paragraph: “ Among these *we*

* “ Dans la première partie il distingue les pechez, d’avec
 “ les crimes: Il dit qu’il ne faut pas s’imaginer que les hommes
 “ soient obligez à faire penitence pour une infinité de pechez
 “ legers, dont personne n’est exempt, &c.—Ainsi après avoir par-
 “ donné, pour ainsi dire, une infinité de pechez, sans qu’il soit
 “ besoin de remèdes forts pour les guerir, il y en a un petit nom-
 “ bre qu’il estoit facile d’éviter, qui meritent une severe puni-
 “ tion.” P. 306.

“ Il rapporte ces pechez à l’idolatrie, à l’homicide, &c. à
 “ l’adultère: pour les autres pechez, dit il, on les guerit par la
 “ pratique des bonnes œuvres.—Par leurs vertus contraires.”

“ Il recommande particulièrement la penitence publique pour
 “ les pechez de l’idolatrie, d’homicide, & de fornication. Il
 “ faut entendre sous ces trois pechez tous les suites de ces crimes
 “ qui s’étendent bien loin.” P. 311.

† Dupin, p. 795. A. D. 304.

‡ Ibid. p. 770. A. D. 305. See also, “ Canon 3. du Com-
 cile du Valence, p. 884.

“ may

“ *may distinguish the inextinguishable guilt of calumniating*
 “ a bishop, a presbyter, or even a deacon.” Even
 this does not occur at the place referred to. The
 authority our historian should have quoted, is,
 “ the 75th canon of the council of Elvira,” which
 “ deprives of the communion, even at death, those
 “ *who have FALSELY accused of CRIMES, a bishop,*
 “ a priest, or a deacon*.”

We should imagine, from our author's representation, that on the slightest expression in conversation, detracting from the character of a priest, this severe punishment was inflicted. Far otherwise is the real state of the case. It evidently implies *a false accusation in public of some great crime*, which is much more than what is commonly understood by mere calumny. But our author, as usual, candidly translates the original words to throw a sneer on the sacred order, even at the expence of his judgment; for the language will not allow the interpretation he has given. In order to make his assertion more specious, he is careful to mention, at the same time, certain crimes of a deep dye; which, he would intimate, a Christian might more safely commit, than be guilty of *calumniating* a bishop, or a deacon. But the words of Dupin strongly express that, to incur this heavy penalty, a person must first have *falsely accused* a priest, in a *public* manner, of some great and *heinous crimes*: Perhaps those of murder, idolatry, or adultery, and their attendants; which are really the crimes here specified, and not those which Mr. G. is pleased *particularly to distinguish*. Besides the crime of false accusation amounts to rank *perjury* in its utmost extent, for which, in

* Le Concile d'Eluire, A. D: 305. p. 780.

“ Le 75 canon prive de la communion même à la mort, ceux
 “ *qui ont accusé de faux crimes, un Evêque, un Prêtre, & un*
 “ *Diaque.*”

those

those days, a severe penance was inflicted. We are to consider also, that it was not only an endeavour to destroy the reputation of an honest innocent man; but that the malignant aspersions were cast on the most respectable characters, the venerable personages on whom the fame and *welfare* of the Christian church chiefly depended; which was, *at that time*, a consideration of importance.

Lastly, let us remember what rigid punishments the clergy themselves were liable to, if the accusation appeared *probable*, or even *suspicious*: We may then see some necessity to enact a severe penalty to prevent and deter men from *falsely* accusing them, through envy, malice, or other iniquitous motives.

Misrepresentation of M. de TILLEMONT.

Mr. G. says, "Christianity must have been very
 " unequally diffused over Pontus, for in the mid-
 " dle of the third century there were no more
 " than seventeen believers in the extensive diocese
 " of Neo-Cæsarea*." He then quotes M. de Tillemont†.

But he has very partially represented the case, and mentioned only *one part* of Tillemont's remark, to prove which, I shall transcribe the whole.

"The city of Neo-Cæsarea," says this author,
 " was either the capital, or one of the most considerable cities of the province, when St. Gregory
 " was made bishop of it, and it was very populous,
 " as well as all the neighbouring country. But all
 " the inhabitants, both of the city and its environs,
 " were still immersed in the darkness of paganism; and they could reckon no more than

* Note 154. c. xv.

† Mémoires Ecclesiastiques, tom. iv. p. 675.

“ seventeen *Christians* there. Notwithstanding the
 “ grace of God wrought in such a wonderful man-
 “ ner by St. Gregory, that *he converted all the peo-*
 “ *ple* both of the city and country, and only left at
 “ his death seventeen *pagans* *.”

Our author has fully answered *his purpose* of shew-
 ing the *small number* of Christians in the diocese,
 by laying before us only the first part of Tillemont’s
 remark ; and by concealing from our view the
amazing increase of converts to the faith in Pontus,
 which this writer takes notice of in the very same
 connected passage †. It should be observed also,
 that Tillemont’s authority relates only to the city
 and its environs ; and that he does not speak of *the*
whole extensive diocese, as Mr. G. has represented
 him.

Misrepresentation of GREGORY of TOURS.

Our speaking of the progress of the Gospel in
 this place, has induced me to reserve the following
 instance, on account of the connection of the subject.

Mr. G. refers to this Father, among other writ-
 ters, in proof of “ the slow progress of the Gospel

* “ Elle, (la ville de Neo-Cesarée) étoit donc ou la capitale,
 “ ou l’une des plus considérables villes de la province, lorsque
 “ St. Gregoire en fut fait Evêque, & fort peuplée, aussi-bien que
 “ tout le pays d’alentour. Mais tous les habitans & de la ville
 “ & des environs estoient encore dans les ténèbres du paganisme,
 “ & l’on n’y pouvoit compter que dix-sept *Chrétiens*. Cepen-
 “ dant la grace de Dieu opera tellement par S. Gregoire qu’il
 “ *convertit tout le peuple* tant de la ville que de la campagne &
 “ n’y laissa en mourant que dix-sept payens.” Partie 2de.
 p. 675. 8vo. edir.

† From this representation of Tillemont, we must infer, that
 our historian had little reason to question the veracity of Lucian’s
 expression, when he says, that “ his native country of Pontus
 “ was filled with Epicureans and *Christians*. This was under
 “ the reign of Commodus. Lucian. in Alexand. c. 25.”

“ in

“ in Gaul :” And that, “ even as late as the reign
 “ of Decius, in a few cities only some scattered
 “ churches were supported by the devotion of a
 “ small number of Christians *.”

In direct opposition to this, Gregory says, that
 “ under the reigns of *Hadrian* and *Antoninus*
 “ *many* had even suffered martyrdom in the pro-
 “ vinces of Gaul †.”

And again, that “ under the emperor Decius
 “ there arose many persecutions against the Chris-
 “ tians, and the slaughter of the faithful was so
 “ great, that they could not be numbered ‡.”

By this we are induced to reckon the number of
 Christians there *very great* ; and deem that church
 to be *populous* which could afford so many martyrs.

The other writers, especially Mosheim, do in-
 deed confirm the assertion of Mr. G. ; but here
 again he has blended together such opposite testi-
 mony, that at once prove, *he has not consulted the*
original authors ; but has decked himself out with
 plumes that belong to another.

II.

There is still another *misrepresentation* of TIL-
 LEMONT. Our author says, “ St. Jude the apostle
 “ was the *brother* of Jesus Christ §.” To account
 for this expression he adds, in a note,

“ This appellation was at first understood in
 “ the most obvious sense, and it was supposed,

* P. 511. and note 171. c. xv. Greg. Turon. l. i. c. 28.

† “ Sed et *in Gallis multi* pro *Christi* nomine sunt *per mar-*
tyrium gemmis cælestibus coronati : Quorum passionum historix
 “ apud nos fideliter usque hodie retinentur.” l. i. c. 26.

‡ “ Sub Decio vero imperatore *multa* bella adversum nomen
 “ *Christianum* exoriantur, & *tanta strages* de credentibus fuit, ut
 “ *nec numerari queat.*” Gregorius Turonensis Historia Fran-
 corum, l. i. c. 28. edit. Ruinart. Adrian & Antonin. Impp.

§ Page 538.

“ that the brothers of Jesus were the *lawful issue* of “ *Joseph and Mary* *.” “ See Tillemont *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, tom. i. part iii. and Beausobre, &c.”

But Tillemont is very far from saying that “ the brothers of Jesus Christ were supposed to have been “ *the lawful issue of Joseph and Mary* : He speaks of “ *the ERROR of Helvidius* as arising from this opinion †.” And in one passage he expressly makes use of words directly opposite to this opinion. “ For, speaking of St. Jude,” he says, “ Jude is “ called the brother of Jesus Christ (because he “ was the son of Mary, *sister* of the Holy Virgin, “ and of Cleophas the *brother* of Joseph ‡.”)

It is plain, surely, beyond a doubt, that Tillemont was of a very different way of thinking. Is it not then much more probable that Mr. G. took the whole of his note from Beausobre §? Every remark he makes on this topic, may be extracted from this writer, who, as he quotes Tillemont, might readily furnish him with his reference to that author. This suspicion is still more increased by Mr G.'s having given us no particular reference to any chapter in Tillemont, which was probably done with a view to secure his credit.

* Note 47. c. xvi.

† “ A donné lieu à l'erreur d'Helvide,” tom. i. part iii.

‡ “ Jude qui est appelé frere de Jesus Christ (parcequ'il “ étoit fils de Marie, soeur de la Ste. Vierge, & de Cleophas “ frere de S. Joseph).”

§ *Histoire Critique de Manichéisme*, l. ii. c. 2.

There is, perhaps, some impropriety in our author's quoting both Tillemont and Beausobre on this point; for Beausobre corrects the expression of Tillemont.

See tom. i. liv. ii. c. ii. § 9. 4to edit.

“ Corrigeons en passant un mot de M. Tillemont,” &c. p. 360. &c.

Mis-

Misrepresentation of PAGI.

Mr. G. says, "Pliny was sent into Bithynia (according to Pagi) in the year 110 *."

Now that accurate chronologist places it "in the year 102 : See the fact recorded in his *Critica Historico—Chronologica* in *Annales C. Baronii* †."

I appeal to my reader, if this anachronism does not plainly prove that our historian never looked into Pagi's chronology, though he has not hesitated to make a pompous reference to him in his note ?

Misrepresentation of Lord LYTTLTON.

Our author says, "Whatever opinion we may entertain of the character or principles of Thomas Becket, we must acknowledge that he suffered death with a constancy not unworthy of the primitive martyrs †." In confirmation of this, he cites the authority of Lord Lyttelton's *History of Henry II.* §

Now whoever turns to the noble author, will find that he gives Mr. G. no ground to make this comparison: But as his Lordship has drawn a dark character of this intrepid defender of papal and ecclesiastical authority, our historian would transfer it to the first Christians, in order to throw a stain on their memories; as if the same turbulence of disposition, which had exposed the one to assassination, had exposed the others to martyrdom.

* Note 155. c. xv.

† Anno Domini 102. p. 99. sec. ii. § 3.

‡ Note 82. c. xvi.

§ Vol. ii. p. 592, &c.

Besides,

Besides, by making this remark, he had an opportunity of paying a compliment to the *papists*, by representing Becket as a saint and martyr; while he gives a *suspicious* view of his *character* and *principles*, to please the protestants."

Having now laid before my reader *such a series* of misrepresentations and misquotations of the authors to whom Mr. Gibbon appeals; can there remain the least doubt, that *he has not really consulted the original materials*; though he so confidently assumes to himself this merit? He has doubtless some obligation to me for having given such satisfying proofs of his skill, in *suiting to his purpose* the arguments of every writer, whose name he thought would give credit to his remark. Every one who had ever looked into Mr. Gibbon's history must have instantly perceived, that his principal design was to paint Christianity in odious colours. But it was not perhaps so generally known, nor could it well be conceived, that, in order to finish his picture, he could have had recourse to such an extensive system of gross misrepresentation as I have exposed to the Public in the foregoing sheets.

Proofs of Mr. GIBBON's INACCURACY.

In the former part of this examination, I occasionally took notice of some few of our author's inaccuracies, being such as were connected with his misquotations. A long list of them, however, which have no connection, still remaining, I am obliged to introduce these under a distinct head.

From the very nature of the charge, the instances which I shall bring in support of it, if *sepa-*

considered, have the appearance of being trivial. Nay Mr. G., though he cannot throw upon his printer the blame of the numerous misrepresentations above exposed, may avail himself of such an answer here. But I beg my reader would suppose me incapable of confounding mere errors of the printer with real mistakes of the author: And that such are the instances I now produce, may be confidently asserted; for they have all uniformly preserved their place in the *three* several editions of Mr. G.'s history *: I may therefore urge them

* It may be agreeable to my reader to have a view of the alterations and additions which Mr. G. has made in his last edition of his history, which, after an accurate collation of these two chapters, I can affirm to be as follows:

At note 10. 3d edit. he has quoted Numbers xiv. 11.—“How long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they *believe* me, for all the *signs* which I have shewed among them? It would be easy, but it would be unbecoming; to justify the complaint of the Deity from the whole tenor of the Mosaic law.”

At note 64. he has added, “Yet the curious reader may consult Dailé De Ufu Patrum, l. ii. c. 4.”

He makes this addition to note 65. “The testimony of Justin of his own faith, and that of his orthodox brethren in the doctrine of a Millennium, is delivered in the clearest and most solemn manner, (Dialog. cum Tryphonte Jud. p. 177, 178. edit. Benedictin.) If in the beginning of this important passage there is any thing like an inconsistency, we may impute it, as we think proper, either to the author, or to his transcribers.”

An addition, which shall be afterwards mentioned, he has made to note 70. 2d edit.

At note 72. 2d edit. he has cited Irenæus adv. Hæres. Proöm. P. 3.

I have already noticed the addition he has made respecting the prudence and humanity of Nero being *affected*.

He has inserted the following as the 32d note in c. xvi. 3d edit. “*Odio humani generis convulsi.*” These words may either signify the hatred of mankind towards the Christians, or the hatred of the Christians towards mankind. I have preferred the

them as a compleat body of proof, in support of my general charge, that he must relinquish his boasted claim to *diligence* and *accuracy*.

the latter sense, as the most agreeable to the style of Tacitus, and to the popular error; of which a precept of the Gospel (see Luke xiv. 26.) had been, perhaps, the innocent occasion.

My interpretation is justified by the authority of Lipsius; of the Italian, the French, and the English translators of Tacitus; of Mosheim (p. 102.); of Le Clerc (Hitoria Ecclesiast. p. 427.); of Dr. Lardner (Testimonies, vol. i. p. 345.); and of the Bishop of Gloucester (Divine Legation, vol. iii. p. 38.) But as the word *convicti* does not unite very happily with the rest of the sentence, James Gronovius has preferred the reading of *conjuncti*, which is authorised by the valuable MS. of Florence."

At note 42. 2d edit. " See Dodwell Paucitat. Mart. l. xiii. The Spanish inscription in Gruter is a manifest and acknowledged forgery, contrived by that noted impostor Cyriacus of Ancona, to flatter the pride and prejudices of the Spaniards. See Ferreras, Histoire d'Espagne, tom. i. p. 192."

He has thus enlarged note 116. 2d edit. Euseb. l. vi. c. 28. " It may be presumed, that the success of the Christians had exasperated the increasing bigotry of the Pagans. Dion Cassius, who composed his history under the former reign, had most probably intended for the use of his master those councils of persecution, which he ascribes to a better age, and to the favourite of Augustus. Concerning their oration of Mæcenas, or rather of Dion, I may refer to my own unbiassed opinion (p. 41. note 25.) and to the Abbè de la Bleterie Memoires de l'Academie, tom. xxiv. p. 303. tom. xxv. p. 432."

At page 576. 2d edit. he has altered this sentence. " The motives of conversion, as they may variously be deduced from *faith*, from *virtue*, from *policy*, or from *remorse*, &c." he now writes it, p. 691, 692. 3d edit. " The motives of his conversion, as they may variously be deduced from *benevolence*, from *policy*, from *conviction*, from *remorse*," &c.

He would enforce what he has said at note 178. c. xvi. by asserting, that " such is the *fair* deduction from two remarkable passages in Eusebius," &c.

There are some other alterations which I have omitted, as they are very trivial.

I.

Mr. G. says, "the success of the Gnostics was rapid and extensive *."

To support this, he adds, in the following note: "*Habent apes favos, habent ecclesias et Marcionitæ* †;" is the strong expression of *Tertullian*, which I am obliged to quote from memory ‡.

Mr. G.'s memory has, indeed, failed him here, for *Tertullian's* words are, "*Faciant favos & ves-
pæ; faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitæ* §." Though his inclination prompted him to amend the simile in favour of the *Marcionites*, as much as the useful industrious bee is preferable to the obnoxious wasp.

II.

Mr. G. at note II. c. xv. refers to "Exodus xxiv. 23." and adds, "See a very sensible note in the *Universal History*, vol. i. p. 603. edit. fol." But his subject, respecting the Jews appearing three times in the year before the Lord, required him to have referred to Exodus c. xxxiv. 23. or c. xxiii. 14 or 17 verses.

I wish also to inform my reader that p. 603. in the *Universal History*, which contains the note on this topic, is in vol. ii. not vol. i. edit. folio:

III.

Our historian, in his third edition, has added this note.—"In order to ascertain the degree of

* Page 462.

† That is, "The bees have cells or honey-combs, the Marcionites also have churches."

‡ Note 35. c. xv.

§ "Even the wasps make themselves cells, or nests, and the Marcionites also form churches."

" authority

" authority which the zealous African" (Tertullian) " had acquired, it may be sufficient to allege the testimony of Cyprian, the doctor and guide of all the western churches (see Prudent. Hymn. xiii. 100.) As often as he applied himself to his daily study of the writings of Tertullian, he was accustomed to say, *Da mihi magistrum*; Give me my master." Hieronym. de Viris Illustribus, c. 53.

The ninth Hymn of Prudentius chiefly relates to the passion of Cyprian, and he is there spoken of as a great teacher; but I do not see what reason Mr. G. had to single out line 60: The words of which are: "*Nec minus involitat terris nec ab hoc recedit, orbe.*"

IV.

Besides, his other reference in this note is false, as the words which he quotes are found in Hieronym. de Viris Illustribus, c. 63.—*ἐπίδος τον διδασκαλον*, "*da magistrum.*"

Mr. G. therefore, would have done better not to have added this note, as he has only accumulated his inaccuracies.

V.

Our author, to confirm his remark, that " the community of goods—subsisted in some degree among the antere sect of the Essenians†," appeals to Philo de Vit. Contempla- tiv†.

But in this treatise Philo makes but slight mention of the Essenians, and none at all of any com-

* Note 73. c. xv.

† Page 405.

† Note 127. c. xv.

munity. He speaks of the Therapeutæ, as “with-
“drawing themselves from this life, through the
“hopes and desire of immortality, and leaving
“their possessions to their children or relations*.”

It is highly probable, therefore, that Mr. G. has mistaken the book, since in the preceding one, entitled, “*Whoever studies after virtue, should be free;*” we read the account of their community at large: “Their benevolence,” says Philo, “equality of rank, and admirable community in every respect, are proofs of their philanthropy. “No one has any peculiar property, which does not belong to all. They live in companies, and extend their beneficence to other societies: They have one common apartment, one table; their cloaths and provisions are common to all †.”

Can we now entertain a doubt, whether, if our author had consulted the original, he could have made this gross blunder?

VI.

In confirmation of his remark on “the divine
“obligation of the Mosaic law, in the article of

* Τὸ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ——— (οἱ) διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακαρίας ζωῆς ἡμερὶν τιτελευτηκίαι νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον, ἀπολείπουσι τὰς οὐσίας υἱοῖς ἢ θυγάτρασιν, ἢ ἄλλοις συγγενέσιν, ἢ καὶ ἄλλοις προσκληρονομήμασι. Philon. de Vita Contemplativa. p. 473. Ed. Mangey.

† ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΣΠΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΝ.
(Quod liber sit quilibet virgini studium)

Τὸν δὲ φιλαδελφικὸν διγνῶματι εὐνοίαν ΙΣΟΤΗΤΑ, τὴν πάντες λόγου κρείττονα ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΝ, περὶ ἧς οὐκ ἀχαιοὶ βραχία ἔσμεν.

Ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ οὐδὲς ἐπὶ εὐδίας, ἢ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ πάντων εἶναι συμβέβηκε. Περὶ γὰρ τῆς γὰρ θείας ἀνομιᾶς ἀνακρίπεται καὶ τοῖς ἱερεσὶν ἀφικνουμένη τῶν ὁμοζήλων. Εἴτ' ἐπὶ ταμίῳ ἢ πωτῶν καὶ δαπανῶν, καὶ ποταμῶν ἢ ἰσθμῶν, ποταμῶν δὲ τροφαὶ συσσιτία πικνοῦνται, &c.

“tythes;”

"tythes*;" Mr. G. cites Irenæus adv. Hæres. l. iv. c. 27. 34. and Origen in Num. Homil. li. †

Now this subject is treated by Irenæus, l. iv. c. 13. 18. † and by Origen Homil. xi. in Numerorum caput xxiii.

VII.

Mr. G., happy to have a pretext to cast a blemish on the writings of Eusebius, says, "There was, perhaps, some malice in the remark of Theodorus Metochita, that all who, like Eusebius, had been conversant with the Egyptians delighted in an obscure and intricate style."

In support of this, he refers us to Valesius's note on Eusebius, lib. viii. c. v. § But the present matter occurs in the annotations of Valesius on l. viii. c. 9. where he says, "From this place we learn that Eusebius had been acquainted with Egypt, as Theodorus Metochita witnesses; who observes, that not only the Egyptians themselves, but those also who had been conversant with the Egyptians, made use of a certain intricate and obscure mode of expression in their writings; in the number of whom he ranks Eusebius not in the last place."

* P. 496.

† Note 130. c. xv.

‡ Edit. Grabe. Paris 1716.

§ Note 181. c. xvi.

|| ἡσυχαστὴν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. "Ex hoc loco discimus Eusebium in Egypto versatum fuisse: quod etiam testatur Theodorus Metochita in collectaneis, quo loco observat omnes non modo, Aegyptios; verum etiam eos, qui in Egypto versati sunt, intricata quadam et obscura dictione, in scribendo uti soliti; inter quos non postremo loco recenset Eusebium apostolicum."

We see that our author is not only *inaccurate* in this instance, but has *strained* the words of Theodorus Metochita, quoted by M. de Valois. The learning of this translator, probably, informed Mr. G. of the words of Metochita. We may surely return the compliment to Mr. G. and observe, *without any malice in the remark, that, all who, like him, have been long conversant with the FRENCH, delight in a gaudy, superficial style; Which, like the gay and flimsy dress that distinguishes Gallic levity, makes up in ostentation what it wants in solid worth and real excellence, to recommend it to the man of sense and judgment.*

VIII.

Mr. G., to corroborate his assertion respecting the Millennium*, has cited "Dupin Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique, tom. i. p. 233. and tom. ii. p. 366†."

The first reference directs us nearly to a passage which mentions *Irenæus* as favouring this doctrine, tom. i. p. 221, 222. † But the second reference gives no direction at all to any similar passage. Neither do we meet with the additional circumstances attending its gradual decline, which Mr. G. has specified, nor are reasons, like his, given for the decay of the doctrine §.

* Page 472.

† Note 64. c. xv.

‡ 8vo edit. à Paris 1688.

§ We read of *Justin* holding this doctrine, p. 78. that it was rejected by *Caius*, in the heresy of *Marinibus*, p. 340. by *Cyprian*, p. 534. and by *Origen*, p. 421. Dupin makes a sensible and candid remark at this place.

¶ *Il faut pardonner ces sortes d'opinions à tous les anciens auteurs du Christianisme, n'y en ayant presque pas un seul, qui n'en ait eu de semblables.*

IX.

"The philosophers," says Mr. G., "composed many elaborate treatises, which have since been committed to the flames by the prudence of orthodox emperors."

On this occasion he cites, at one authority, Codex Theodosian. l. i. tit. i. § 3.

I do not here mean to dispute the fact, but the incorrectness of this reference calls for severe admonition. For, lib. i. tit. i. lex 3. Codex Theodosian relates to a very different matter: "The constitutions and edicts of princes."

Mr. G. probably ought to have quoted lib. xvi. tit. v. lex 34. which is, "We enact upon our authority, that the books of the heretics, containing the matter and doctrine of every wickedness, should be searched with the greatest exactness, and brought out; and afterwards be burnt with fire, in the presence of the judges themselves §."

But surely this is a strong instance that our author did not consult this code of laws, otherwise he could not have made a mistake in quoting the very first page.

§ De Hæreticis. "Codices sane eorum, scelerum omnium doctrinam ac materiam continentes, summa sagacitate maxime queri ac prodè ex æstimatione mandamus, in inspectibus eorum judicantibus cremandos." Lib. xvi. tit. v. lex 34. See also lex 66, &c.

De Constitutionibus Principum et Edictis. "Omnia constituta non præteritis calumniam faciant, sed futuris regulam imponunt. Cod. Theodosian, l. i. tit. i. l. 3.

§ De Hæreticis. "Codices sane eorum, scelerum omnium doctrinam ac materiam continentes, summa sagacitate maxime queri ac prodè ex æstimatione mandamus, in inspectibus eorum judicantibus cremandos." Lib. xvi. tit. v. lex 34. See also lex 66, &c.

X.

Our author refers us to " Seneca Quest. Natur. I. 1. 15." &c.* where we are to find " recorded the great phenomena of nature, earthquakes, eclipses, &c. †"

But the last of these two references is, doubtless, false, as lib. i. c. 15. *Naturalium Questionum Seneca*, treats of a very different matter from eclipses.

XI.

Our author says, " According to the maxims of universal toleration, the Romans protected a superstition which they despised †."

For this he refers to Cicero pro Flacco c. 23. § but on examination we shall find that the subject is contained in c. 28. †

XII.

He observes, that " the Jews were alarmed and scandalized at the ensigns of paganism which necessarily introduced themselves into a Roman province. ***"

And adds, " see in particular *Joseph. Antiquitat. xvii. 6. xviii. 6. ††*"

Each of these chapters treats of a different subject. The point in question is discussed in lib. xvii. c. 9. in which Josephus relates " a se-

* Note 195. c. xv.

† Page 518.

† Page 518.

§ Note 5. c. xv.

‡ See the *Olivet*, Glasgow, &c. Editions.

•• Page 454.

†† Note 7. c. xv.

"dition of the Jews after the death of Herod,"
and again we read of their tumults, lib. xviii. c.
4. 9. *

XIII.

Mr. G. appeals for a description of Curubis,
to "Cellarius, Geograph. Antiq. part iii. p. 96 +.
"Shaw's Travels, p. 90;" and adds, "for the
"adjacent country, see l'Afrique de Marmol.,
"tom. ii. p. 474. †"

But we find this description of Curubis in Dr.
Shaw's Travels, p. 160. § and in l'Afrique de
Marmol. tom. ii. p. 434. || not 474. to which,
Mr. G. inaccurately directs us.

XIV.

"Simony," says our author, "was not un-
"known in those times; and the clergy sometimes
"bought what they intended to sell. It appears
"that the bishopric of Carthage was purchased by
"a wealthy matron, named Lucilla, for her ser-
"vant Majorinus. The price was 400 folles."
He then refers to Monument. Antiq. ad Calcem
Optati. p. 203. **

* See Hudson's edition of Josephus, Oxon. 1788. q

† In Patrick's edition of Cellarius, Curubis is described in
c. xxvi. under the head of *Africa Propria*. Zeogitana, p.
117. His words are, "Curubis is situated on the promontory
"of Mercury, now *Cape Bona*. "Curubis sita supra pro-
"montorium Mercurii (*Equator. angar.*) nunc *Cape Bona*."

‡ Note 82. xvi. § Ed. Fol. Oxon: 1738.

|| 4to Ed. Paris 1667. ** Note 126. c. xvi.

Mr.

Mr. G. has referred in one note⁴ to Dupin's edition; but in this edition the passage occurs at p. 170, 171. †; we have then reason to suspect that he did not gain his information from this original.

XV!

Our author, speaking of "the stupendous metamorphosis of St. James, from a peaceful fisherman, into a valorous knight," &c. † cites Mariana " (Hist. Hispan. v. 16. 13.) § " But here again he has displayed great inaccuracy. For the circumstance alluded to by him is related in Mariana. (Hist. Hispan. l. xi. c. 13.) ||

Mariana's account of St. James's arrival in Spain is l. iv. c. 2.—The story of his body being found l. vii. c. 10.

XVI!

Our historian, speaking of "the gardens and circus of Nero on the Varican," adds "on the same spot, a temple, which far surpasses the ancient glories of the Capitol, has been since erected by the Christian pontiffs, &c." * The authority he cites is "Nardini Roma Antica, p. 387. †† But he has mistaken the page, for he should have cited l. vii. c. 13. p. 486, 487. ††

Note 159. c. xvi. † Monumenta vetera

"donatnarum historiam penemiss" † Page 511.
§ Note 174. c. xvi. † Fol. edit. Foletti 1592 and 4to edit. Moguntiz, 1605. ** Page 534. †† Note 33. c. xvi. †† Edit. 2da in Roma 1704.

XVII.

Mr. G. in a note refers to "Theophilus ad Antolychum, lib. iii. p. 77;" whereas he should have written it Antolychum, for that was the name of the Grecian nobleman: Besides, both the fact and page 77, are contained in lib. i. †

XVIII.

He says, "See a very curious Dissertation on the Vestals in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. ii. p. 161—227. †" But l'Histoire des Vestales par M. L'Abbé Nadau is in tom. iv. p. 161—227.

XIX.

Mr. G. says, after speaking of "the mode of persecution which Edward I. practised with great success against the clergy of England: See Hume's History of England, vol. i. p. 300. last 4to edition. §"

Now he should have quoted vol. ii. p. 300, &c.

XX.

An inaccuracy of this kind occurs also at a note where he refers us to "Chrysostom. Opera, tom. vii. p. 658. 810. Ed. Savit. ||"

His authority is cited in confirmation of this passage:

"The ancient and illustrious church of Antioch consisted of one hundred thousand persons, three thousand of whom were supported out of the public oblations **."

* Note 76. c. xv.

† Note 92. c. xv.

|| Note 157. c. xv.

† Fol. edit. Lutet.

§ Note 152. c. xvi.

** Page 507.

Now it is highly strange, that this reference exactly answers to the *Benedict* edition, but is not right in the *Savil*. Can we think then that Mr. G. ever consulted the *Savilian* edition?

XXI.

Mr. G. brings discredit on his note 171. c. xv. by referring us to the “*Geographia Sacra* of “Charles de St. Paul, with the observations of “Lucas Holsternius.” Now the author’s name, not unknown in the class of writers, is Holsternius.

XXII.

Mr. G. says, “Many, though very confused, “circumstances that relate to the conversion of “Iberia and Armenia, may be found in Moses “of Chorene, l. ii. c. 78.—89.”

But it is c. 83. which contains the particular account †.

XXIII.

Our author says, “It appears, however, that “about forty years afterwards, the Emperor Valerian was persuaded of the truth of this assertion, since in one of his rescripts he evidently “supposes, that Senators, Roman knights, and “ladies of quality, were engaged in the Christian sects ‡.” In confirmation of this he appeals to Cyprian, epist. 79. §

* Note 176. c. xv.

† 4to edit. Whiston. Lond. 1736.

‡ Page 515.

§ Note 188. c. xv.

But

But epistle 79th, in *Fell's* edition*, is addressed "to Cyprian from Felix Jader, Polianus," &c. and in *Pamelius's* edition, from *Lucius*; yet no mention is made in the 79th epistle of either of these editions, of "Senators, Roman knights, or ladies of quality, who were engaged in the Christian sects."

XXIV.

Mr. G. refers us to "Acta Concil. Carthag. apud Cyprian, Edit. Fell. p. 158. †". Yet in *Fell's* edition of Cyprian's works these acts occur at c. l. p. 229. †

XXV.

He says, "See the sharp epistle from Firmilianus bishop of Cæsarea to Stephen bishop of Rome." Ap. Cyprian. epist. 75. §

In *Fell's* edition, this epistle is addressed to Cyprian. ||

XXVI.

He quotes also Cyprian's treatise de Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 75.—86. **: but in *Fell's* edition it is contained p. 104.—111.

* As Mr. G. has particularly quoted *Fell's* edition of Cyprian's work, and specified no other, it is but reasonable to expect his references to be adjusted to it; but, on the contrary, we find those disagreements which I here mention.

† Note 113. c. xv.

‡ "Per Joannem Oxoniensem Episcopum; & Annales Cyprianici per Joannem Cestriensem."

§ Note 123. c. xv.

|| The title is, "Firmilianus Cypriano fratri in Domino salutem."

** Note 115. c. xv.

XXVII.

XXVII.

Again he refers to "Cyprian de Lapsis" p. 87.—98, edit. Fell*: Now in this very edition the treatise is from p. 129. to 131.

I might have noticed many other inaccurate references of this kind, but I really am afraid lest I should have already wearied out my reader's patience in such minute remarks: The whole, *collectively* considered, must give evident proofs that, had our author consulted the original materials, he could not have made so many mistakes. And though these several instances, considered in a *separate* view, appear trivial and minute, like the scattered beams of the sun, diffusing warmth with a benignant but *less sensible* influence; yet, when the many proofs are considered as composing a *great body*, like the same rays, *collected in a focus*, they make us instantly *sensible* of their *great power and effect*.

I should now proceed to my third charge of plagiarism; but as I have ~~some~~ other observations to make, which could not well be reduced under any distinct head, I beg leave to lay them before my reader at this place.

Though our historian descants upon "*the universal toleration of polytheism*," with the utmost exertion of his florid pen †; yet his assertions are frequently *inconsistent* ‡.

* Note 89. c. xvi.

† These arguments of Mr. G. are opposed and confuted by Dr. Watson in his Apology (letter vi. p. 171, &c.) and by the Author of the Remarks (p. 47, &c.) who truly observes, that, "these pages of our author's disquisitions, (in c. xvi.) while they *fear* of the conduct of the Roman government towards the Christians, contain in reality a *laboured apology* for it, "rather than a *disinterested relation* of mere facts," &c.

‡ See a particular instance noted by Dr. Watson, Apology, p. 188.

He tells us, that “ the Jews, and *Christians* also, *justly* forfeited the rights of toleration by their inflexible zeal for their religions; and by refusing the accustomed tribute of indulgence to Polytheism *.” Yet he himself speaks of “ the *benevolent*, the *innocent*, the *inoffensive* mode of the Christian faith and worship, and extols them as the friends human kind †.”

In one place, our author speaks of “ the *reverence* of the Roman princes and governors for “ the temple of Jerusalem, &c. ‡”

But what a *different* strain is this, from what we meet with at the beginning of the 15th chapter : “ According to the maxims of universal toleration, “ the Romans protected a *superstition* (that is, the “ Jewish) which *they despised* §.”

And though he adds, “ the polite Augustus “ *condescended* to give orders, that sacrifices should “ be offered for his prosperity in the temple of Jerusalem :” Yet we find a contrast in his note on this very passage. “ Augustus left a foundation “ for a perpetual sacrifice : Yet *he approved of the* “ *neglect* his grandson Caius expressed towards the “ temple of Jerusalem ||.”

* The same author has refuted Mr. G.’s favourite reason, which he assigns for the cause of the persecutions, namely, that as “ the rights of toleration were held by mutual indulgence : they were *justly* forfeited by a refusal of the accustomed tribute, which the Jews first, and the Christians afterwards, inflexibly refused.”

This his argument teaches us what the *humane* toleration of Polytheism was ; to *persecute* all those who were of a different persuasion.

† Page 519. 537.

§ Page 451.

‡ Page 521.

|| Note 6. c. xv.

In order to extricate himself from the difficulties with which he is embarrassed in endeavouring to give a specious pretext for the *polite* Romans having persecuted the Christians; Mr. Gibbon has made use of an argument, not only inconsistent with the avowed principles of *free-thinking*, but even with those of the *reformation*. “*It was incumbent on them,*” says he, “*to persevere in the sacred institutions of their ancestors: By embracing the faith of the Gospel, the Christians had incurred the supposed guilt of an unnatural and unpardonable offence. They dissolved the sacred ties of custom and education, violated the religious institutions of their country, and presumptuously despised whatever their fathers had believed as true, or had revered as sacred* *.” These are the weak arguments which popery so strenuously urged to maintain its establishment. The *validity* of which, had our forefathers acknowledged, we had still languished under its yoke; nor ever tasted the sweets of our glorious liberty in church and state. No wonder after this, that Mr. G. should speak of ap offibility; that “*circumstances could authorize religious persecutions by the most specious arguments of political justice and public safety* †.”

I cannot

* Page 523.

† As our author, with a view to prejudice Christianity, represents it as *necessarily* containing something *very criminal*, that it could compel the *polite* and *humane* people of Rome to persecute those who professed it, I shall obviate any such suspicion in the words of Mosheim.

“*Qui hodie Christianæ religionis divinitatem oppugnant, uti-
“ averse captant omnia quæ suspicionis aliquid gignere in menti-
“ bus imperitorum possunt: ita etiam Romanorum erga Christi-
“ anos odium adhibent ad invidiam religioni Christianæ crean-
“ dam. Sapientissimus, aiunt, qui post orbem conditum fuit,
“ populus,*

I cannot help observing that *unfeelingness* which Mr. G. shews, though not without the greatest inconsistency, whenever he has occasion to speak of the sufferings of the persecuted Christians. That we may be more convinced of this, I have collected his sentiments on the subject dispersed through his work.

Though he himself admits the *scandalous* accusations raised against the Christians to be *unjust* and *malicious**; yet he enlarges on the topic with an apparent pleasure; and talks, with satisfaction, of their "*deserved infamy, and just punishment*†." Unmoved with compassion, he relates the horrid persecutions raised against the Christians in obedience to the *popular clamours*, which "*doomed them to the severest tortures*." Yet our author, unknowing how to feel for Christian woe, "*APPLAUDS the humanity of the Roman magistrates, and the excessive lenity of the governors, who, usually, were inclined to gratify the inclinations of a licentious people, by whom the voice of compassion was not heard; and to appease the rage of an exasperated populace, by the sacrifice of a few obnoxious victims*." These obnoxious victims were *the Christians*; *obnoxious*, because "*they abhorred the false gods of mankind*," (that is, the idols of Rome) "*and by their ab-*

"*populus, idemque humanissimus, nullique mortalium religionis nomine molestus, Christianam tamen religionem unam saluti publicæ noxiam judicabat & ferre nolebat. Ex hoc rectissime effeceris, fuisse in primis Christianis vitia & maculas tranquillitati ac saluti civitatis magnū periculum & perniciem minantes. Qui tam inique suspicantur, suam ipsi produnt inficitiam, veterumque rerum Romanarum se ignaros ostendunt.*" Hist. Christ. sæc. i. § 27. p. 101.

* Page 526—529.

† Page 533, 534.

“ sence and melancholy on these solemn festivals, “ seemed to *insult* or *lament* the public felicity *.”

These he elsewhere calls “ *elegant* ceremonies “ and *innocent* devotion † :” While every one, the least versed in pagan mythology, cannot be ignorant of their *profane* ceremonies and *obscene* devotion ; and even Mr. G. acknowledges, that “ they “ contributed to extinguish humanity.”

What a medley of inconsistent reflections have we here in the very words of our author ? How hostile a disposition does he discover to Christianity ? What feeling person but must express astonishment, to find such cruel proceedings dignified with the title of *humanity* ?

I might insist on the *impropriety*, nay *falsety* of his expression, that “ *the Christian religion grew up “ in silence and obscurity ‡.*” This is by no means consonant to the received opinion of mankind, both Jews and Gentiles. It is certain, on the contrary, that this religion made every possible noise in the world that its nature would admit of. We see the whole nation of the Jews in commotion in its infant state, and the Gentile powers shortly after united against it. So that we may say, in the words of the royal Psalmist, which probably were dictated by inspiration, with a prophetic and secondary view to this great event : “ The kings of “ the earth set themselves, and the rulers take “ counsel together, against the Lord, and against “ his anointed §.”

* Page 542, 543.

† Page 464—466.

‡ C. xv. p. 449.

§ Psalm ii. 2.

See Dr. Horne's comment on this psalm ; and Bishop Atterbury's Sermon I. vol. iii. “ *This thing was not done in a corner.*” See also Sermon III. IV. vol. i.

I could

I could oppose his assertion, that "The obligation of preaching to the Gentiles the faith of Moses, had never been inculcated as a precept of the law; and that the Jews were not inclined to impose it on themselves as a voluntary duty *;" with the sentiment of the learned Le Clerc, who says, that "*the Jews strained every nerve of their ingenuity to recall the heathen from idolatry †.*"

Besides, our Saviour's speech to the Pharisees, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte ‡," must surely overthrow this sentiment of Mr. G's. And we may ask, how it happened, that they ever had any proselytes, if this mode of conversion was neglected? For what reason likewise, were the several laws enacted by God, respecting the *stranger* and *proselyte*, if he and his people were so *indifferent*, as Mr. G. represents them, with respect to admitting the Gentiles into covenant with him? Yet it cannot be denied, that the whole Mosaic law abounds with such precepts. We may, therefore, safely conclude, that the "*Jews did really preach the faith of Moses to the Gentiles,*" in hopes of converting them.

I might justly censure our author's having absolutely condemned the passage of Josephus, respecting our Saviour, as "an example of no vulgar *forgery §;*" because many learned and judicious

* Page 453.

† "Cum is esset gentis Judaicæ status, multa poterant Judæis o jici ab Ethnicis, quibus ægrè respondebant; unde sine dubio fiebat, ut pauciores multo proselytas ad se adicere possint, licet omnes ingenii nervos ad Ethnicos ab idololatria revocandos intendissent." Le Clerc. Prolegom. c. vii. § 1.

‡ St. Matt. xxiii. 15.

§ Note 35. c. xvi.

persons acknowledge its authenticity*. And though we should allow it to be an interpolation, in compliance to the judgment of some great critics; yet the ingenious and able *Bullet* has assigned very sufficient reasons, which might have induced Josephus not to mention this well-known fact †; and

* See what may be advanced in favour of this passage, set forth in a learned and ingenious manner, in a late publication entitled "*Vindicia Flaviana*."

† The original is written in French; I have extracted the translation of the particular passage.

" This historian (Josephus) either believed, that the whole account of Jesus's disciples, concerning their master, was false, or he believed that it was true. In the first case, he would not have been silent. Every thing led him to speak on such an occasion; the interest of truth; zeal for his religion, the foundations of which the Christians sapped by their impostures; love of his countrymen, whom the disciples of Jesus accused of having put to death, by a malignant and cruel jealousy, the Messiah, the Son of God. By detecting the imposture of the apostles, Josephus would have covered the enemies of his people with confusion, rendered himself agreeable to his countrymen, conciliated the favour of the emperors, who would fain have stifled Christianity in its birth. He would have engaged the applauses of all those who held this religion in abhorrence, and undeceived those very Christians, whom the first disciples of Jesus had deluded. Now, is it possible to believe, that a man, well acquainted with a cheat, which it is so much his interest to publish, should be so scrupulously and profoundly silent upon it, especially when so natural an occasion offered itself to mention it? If false miracles should be vented among the people, tending to unsettle their faith, with what zeal would our writers labour to detect the imposture, and to prevent their seduction? Would they not think, and with good reason, that silence on such an occasion was a criminal prevarication? It seems evident, therefore, that, if Josephus believed, that what the apostles said of their master was false, he would have taken care to make it known. If he did not believe it to be false, he believed it to be true. And it was nothing, but the fear of displeasing his own nation, the Romans, and the emperor, that stopped his mouth;

and has thereby proved, that no disadvantage can result to Christianity from his having passed it over in silence.

I might urge, on the authority of the learned Lardner, the *improbability*, if not *impossibility*, that the Christians, as being called *Galileans*, could be confounded with "the sect of the *Gaulonites* *." Our author's intention in confounding them was manifestly to asperse the character of the first Christians, by supposing them so criminal as to be capable of being mistaken for "*the new and pernicious sect of the Gaulonites.*"

I might observe, that as the Spanish inscription in Gruter, is not so *universally* granted to be false as Mr. G. intimates †; it stands as a proof, that Nero's persecution of the Christians *spread itself from Rome into the provinces, and was authorised by public edicts* ‡.

I might say, with good reason, that Dr. Lardner's suspicions of *bigotry* in Pliny's conduct, seem well grounded §; though our author has censured them ||.

"mouth: In which case, *his silence is as good as his testimony*,
"and equally serves to authenticate the truth of the facts, upon
"which Christianity is founded." *History of the Establishment of Christianity.*

* I have before quoted the passage from Lardner.

† Note 42. c. xvi. Gruter, p. 238. N^o. 9.

‡ Dr. Lardner, though he allows the inscription to have been esteemed as false by some persons, and nor without probable reasons; yet seems to argue the point with great desire to establish its authenticity: And asserts, on the authority of Tertullian, Lactantius, and Sulpicius Severus, the *universality* of Nero's persecution, in the words I have quoted from him. Vol. i. c. iii. *Heathen Testimonies*, p. 336, &c.

§ Vol. ii. c. ix. *Testimonies*, p. 45; 46.

|| Note 56. c. xvi.

I might justify Mosheim in his refinement, as Mr. G. is pleased to style it*, on the worship of Alexander Severus, by conclusive arguments†.

I might assert, that our author, by adhering too strictly to the sentiment of Dodwell, has greatly diminished the real number of martyrs: The candid Mosheim seems to fix the proper boundary between legendary fiction and sceptical diffidence‡.

I might ask, on what authority our author informs us, that “both Dr. Burnet and Mr. Moyle “were unacquainted with the passage in Chrysostom,” which he quotes§? This I know, that Burnet||; and, if I remember right, Moyle likewise, refers to it. I am, therefore, more inclined to think that Mr. G. is *only* acquainted with the passage in Chrysostom from their reference and quotation; which suspicion receives a great degree of probability, from his having made such a gross blunder, in quoting one edition of Chrysostom, while his references answer to another.

* Note 115. c. xvi.

† Mosheim, de rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. sæc. iii. § 8. p. 464, 465.

‡ I shall briefly extract the particular passage.

“Postquam vero *H. Dodwellus* veterem hanc sententiam infirmare ausus est, *multi extiterunt, qui paucos tantum extrema supplicio ob Christianam religionem affectos esse, cum ipso adseverarunt*: Quibus alii vehementer tamquam divinæ virtutis obsecratoribus resistunt. *Mediam* inter oppositas has sententias *viam* qui tenent, illi propius a veritate remoti videntur. Non tot sunt, quot olim numerabantur, & hodie a multis adhuc numerantur: *At plures etiam sunt, quam Dodwellus & amici ejus putant*,” &c. Sæc. i. pars i. c. v. § 11. Institut. Hist. Eccles.

§ Note 168. c. xv.

|| Burnet's Travels into Italy.

I might

I might ask, in what respect Christianity had corrupted *the purity* of Roman manners?

This system of love and benevolence (which even Mr. G. allows it to be) might indeed have humanized the brutal ferocity which distinguished the *purity* of Roman manners; and might have taught the heart of Decius to pity and redress the cruel treatment of the Christians.

But why is it *more reasonable* to believe, that “Decius, in the prosecution of his general design to *restore the purity* of Roman manners, was desirous of *delivering* the empire from what he condemned as *a recent and criminal* superstition;” than to believe “that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor *?” Surely, if “his virtues will scarcely allow us to suspect” the latter; his being actuated by the former motive, will bring his virtues themselves into suspicion.

I could prove, that Mr. G., like *Rousseau*, one of his famous predecessors in infidelity, while he *hypocritically* launches out in the praises of revelation, and *affects* to treat it with reverence and esteem; really endeavours to expose and place it in a ridiculous light. For he represents it as springing up at a time when “the weakness of *polytheism*, being fully exposed and exploded by the scepticism of the pagans;” “the *fall* of this “system of mythology would probably have been “succeeded by the introduction of *some other mode of* “*superstition* :—if, in the decisive moment, the “wisdom of *Providence* had not interposed a genuine revelation, fitted to inspire the most rational esteem and conviction; whilst, at the same “time, it was adorned with all that could attract

" the attention, the wonder, and the veneration of
" the people *."

From the words of Mr. G. one would think, that *the mode of Christian superstition casually* sprung up in a lucky moment, and succeeded of course to the drooping mythology of paganism; and that the essence of Christianity consisted in the performance of numerous rites and ceremonies in superb temples, to attract the wonder of the gazing croud.

Observe also, with what impious disrespect he speaks of the Mosaic law: "*The law of Moses*" might be for the most part frivolous or absurd†."

Though I entirely agree with our author " that the conquests of Rome prepared and facilitated those of Christianity;†" yet I might easily confute his assertion, that " the Christian missionaries did not encounter any of the obstacles which

* Page 502—505. † Page 523. ‡ Page 505.

The Christian may hence learn to admire and adore the all-seeing and all-powerful ways of Providence: that God should thus employ the secondary means of weak men, without their intent, to facilitate the progress of his religion. Our elegant historian, Dr. Robertson, has described, in most nervous and graceful language, the manner in which the *union and tranquillity* of the Roman empire conduced to the rapid progress of Christianity. " The noblest people," says he, " that ever entered upon the stage of the world, appear to have been only instruments in the divine hand, for the execution of wise purposes, concealed from themselves. The *Roman* ambition and bravery paved the way, and prepared the world for, the reception of the Christian doctrine. They fought and conquered, that it might triumph with the greater ease. *Howbeit they meant not so, neither did their hearts think so: But it was in their heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few.* Isaiah x. 7."

See his Sermon " On the Situation of the World at Christ's Appearance, p. 13, &c."

" usually

“ usually retard or prevent the introduction of a foreign religion into a distant country.” He talks of the great service of the Roman highways, as opening an easy passage for the propagators of Christianity; as if the inconveniencies and impediments of travelling were the *only* obstacles they had to surmount. And yet he himself relates those *dreadful persecutions* which must cause other breasts to heave with the commiserating sigh; and speaks of such *severe punishments* which they suffered, that from other eyes must draw the sympathetic tear.

I might refuse his whole plan of accounting for “ the rise and progress of Christianity from secondary causes,” in the words of another eminent writer, whose conversion does as much honour to Christianity, as his candid avowal of it does to his heart. “ The propagation of this religion,” says he, “ was not less extraordinary, than the religion itself; nor less above the reach of all human power, than the discovery of it was above that of all human understanding *.”

I might expatiate at large on each of these, and on several other topics; but my reader will, I hope, excuse my having thus cursorily mentioned them; it not being my object, in this *examination*, to attack our author upon his principles, but to convict him of unfairness in his method of supporting them.

If, in spite of the numerous instances of *misquotation* and *inaccuracy*, which I have produced, it be possible for any one still to credit the boast of Mr. Gibbon, that *he has consulted all the original materials*; to put the matter beyond all doubt, I proceed now to shew within how narrow a circle

* Mr. Soame Jenyns.—Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion, p. 19.. and 104.

his erudition, however pompously displayed, is confined. This will be easily done, by laying before my reader, extracts from a *few modern writers*; from which it will appear evident, even to a demonstration, that our historian has not only the same chain of *thoughts*, but often that his very *expressions* are borrowed: And a single glance of the eye will convince us, that his pompous quotations of the Fathers, and other learned authors of antiquity, are but transcribed from the marginal references of these writers.

My reader may, perhaps, be surprised that I should mention a *similarity of thoughts* as a proof of *plagiarism*: But if we consider that Mr. G.'s talents shine most conspicuously in the elegance of language, we must naturally imagine, that he would not constantly adopt *the very words* of the author, as he could so easily set off the sentiments in new and more graceful expressions, which would, at the same time, serve to disguise the plagiarism*. Besides, it being my intent to prove to the Christian world, that our author has, in fact, produced *no new* objections against our religion, and that his boasted attack is made with arguments and reflexions long ago exploded; to convict him of a *similarity of sentiment* fully answers this purpose.

I proceed now to the proof of my charge; and, for the sake of the English reader, shall begin with *Dr. Middleton*.

Instances of PLAGIARISM.

When I gave an instance of Mr. G.'s misrepresentation of Irenæus, I promised to inform my read-

* The sentences and expressions which Mr. G. has more closely copied, are distinguished by *Italics*: To which, if my reader directs his eye, he will be instantly sensible of the plagiarism.

er how he was betrayed into it: Without consulting the Father, he had contented himself with the representation of *Middleton*; who was not himself very remarkable for accuracy of quotation, as *Dr. Pearce* has demonstrated †.

MIDDLETON *says,*

The Words of
Mr. GIBBON *are,*

I.

“ *Irenæus, however, declares it (the gift of all kinds of languages) to have been indulged to many in his days. But it is very remarkable, that this primitive bishop, who ascribes it so liberally to others, appears to have been in great want of it himself, for the propagation of the Gospel in his own diocese, among the Celtae or Gauls; where, as Dr. Cave interprets his words, “ it was not the least part of his trouble, that he was forced to learn the language of the country, a rude and*

“ *The knowledge of foreign languages was frequently communicated to the contemporaries of Irenæus, though Irenæus himself was left to struggle with the difficulties of a BARBAROUS DIALECT, whilst he preached the Gospel to the natives of Gaul*.*

† See his two replies to *Dr. Middleton's* letter to *Dr. Waterland*.

* P. 475. Our author, in a note, makes an observation with respect to these words of *Middleton*, though he is far from acknowledging that he borrowed any thought from him; hoping, no doubt, by this indirect method, to which he frequently has recourse, to evade the accusation of being a *plagiary*.

His words are, “ *Dr. Middleton (Free Inquiry, p. 96, &c.) observes, that as this pretension of all others was the most difficult to support by art, it was the soonest given up. The observation suits his hypothesis.*” Note 72. c. xv.

“ *bar.*

"barbarous dialect, before he could do any good upon them†."

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

II.

"As to the first, and principal indeed of all miracles, that of raising the dead; it was frequently performed, as Irenæus affirms, on necessary occasions; and men, so raised, had lived afterwards among them many years, &c. Irenæus, l. ii. 56 *.

In the very same age, when one Autolycus, an eminent heathen, challenged his friend Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, a convert and champion of the Gospel, to shew him but one person who had

"In the days of Irenæus, about the end of the second century, the resurrection of the dead was very far from being esteemed an uncommon event; that the miracle was frequently performed on necessary occasions, by great fasting, and the joint supplication of the church of the place, and the persons thus restored to their prayers, had lived afterwards among them many years †. Irenæus, l. ii. 56, 57. l. v. c. 6.

At such a period, when faith

† Vol. i. p. 245. 246. 8vo edit.

* I here mean to point out to my reader the false grounds on which Dr. Middleton, and his servile transcriber Mr. Gibbon, build this presumptuous assertion. The words of Irenæus do not give them authority to say that, IN HIS DAYS, the resurrection of the dead was frequently performed on necessary occasions. The Father speaks of this, and other miracles, as having been done in times past. Our author, in thus taking for granted the assertion of Middleton, has been as greatly deceived, as the credulous traveller who pursues an *Ignis Fatuus* as his guide. But I need not enlarge on this matter, for the fallacious argument of the *Free-Inquirer* has been long ago totally refuted and exploded, by Dr. *Jortin*, in his "Remarks on Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii. p. 14, &c. And by Dr. *Douglas* in his *Criterion*, p. 374, &c.

† Note 75. c. xv.

MIDDLETON.

had been raised from the dead, on the condition of turning Christian himself upon it; Theophilus discovers by his answer, that he was not able to give him that satisfaction*. Theoph. ad Autol. l. i. p. 77.

whole controversy, and promised Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, that if he could be gratified with the sight of a single person, who had been actually raised from the dead, he would immediately embrace the Christian religion. It is somewhat remarkable, that the prelate of the first eastern church, however anxious for the conversion of his friend, thought proper to decline this fair and reasonable challenge†. Theophilus ad Autolychem, lib. ii. p. 77‡.

Mr. Dodwell, however, from this single authority of Irenæus asserts the miraculous powers of the second century to be superior even to those of the first. Dissert. ii. in Iren. § 42. p. 165||.

GIBBON.

faith could boast of so many wonderful victories over death, it seems difficult to account for the scepticism of those philosophers, who still rejected and derided the doctrine of the resurrection. A noble Grecian had rested on this important ground the

Mr. Dodwell concludes, that the second century was still more fertile in miracles than the first §." Dissert. ad Irenæum, ii. 42.

* Page 197.

† Page 476.

‡ I have already observed how inaccurately Mr. G. has here transcribed.

|| Page 197.

§ Note 75. c. xv.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

III.

“ The whole system of pagan idolatry was believed by the Fathers to have been managed by the craft and agency of dæmons,—for the sake of deluding and destroying mankind. They imagined them to *assume the names*, and to act the parts of, the heathen gods†: Vagrant jugglers imposed the tricks of their art as *the effects of supernatural power*, on a multitude already persuaded that *they lived on magic ground*, exposed at every step to snares and charms, contrived by *malicious spirits perpetually baunting them* *, &c.

“ It was the universal sentiment, both of the church and of heretics, that the dæmons were the authors, the patrons, and the objects of idolatry. That they were still permitted to roam upon earth, to torment the bodies, and to seduce the minds of sinful men; that they had distributed among themselves the most important characters of polytheism, one dæmon *assuming the name* and attributes of Jupiter, another of Æsculapius, &c. §

The most curious, or the most credulous, among the pagans, were often persuaded to enter into a *society which asserted an actual claim of miraculous powers*. The primitive Christians perpetually *trod on mystic ground*, and their minds were exercised by the habits of believing the most extraordinary events. They felt, or they *fancied*, that on every side *they were incessantly assailed by dæmons*, comforted by visions, &c.

“ When pious Christians are arrived to this pitch

“ The real or imaginary prodigies, of which they

MIDDLETON.

pitch of credulity,—their very piety will oblige them to admit as miraculous whatever is pretended to be wrought in defence of the Gospel, and to make them of course the implicit dupes of their own wonder-workers *.”

GIBBON.

they so frequently believed themselves to be the objects, the instruments, or the spectators, very happily disposed them to adopt with the same ease, but with far greater justice, the authentic wonders of the evangelic history, &c.” †

IV.

“Justin, Martyr frequently appeals to what every one might see with his own eyes, in every part of the world, and particularly in Rome, in the case of persons possessed with devils; who were cured and set free, and the devils themselves, baffled and driven away, by the Christians, adjuring, or exorcising them in the name of Jesus, when all other exorcists and incanters had tried in vain to help them †.”

Tertullian challenges the heathen magistrates to call before their tribunals, any person possessed

“The expulsion of the demons from the bodies of those unhappy persons whom they had been permitted to torment, was considered as a signal though ordinary triumph of religion, and is repeatedly alleged by the ancient apologists as the most convincing evidence of the truth of Christianity. The awful ceremony was usually performed in a public manner, and in the presence of a great number of spectators; the patient was relieved by the power or skill of the exorcist, and the vanquished demon was heard

to

* Page 195.

† Page 131.

† Page 473.

MIDDLETON.

essed with a *devil*: and if the evil spirit, *when exorcised by any Christian whatsoever, did not own himself to be a devil*, as truly, as in other places, he would falsely *call himself a god*, not daring to tell a lie to a Christian, that then they should take the life of that Christian: and *what is more manifest, adds he, than this operation; what more convincing than this proof*?
Apolog. c. 23."

GIBBON.

to confess that he was one of the fabled gods of antiquity, who had impiously usurped the adoration of mankind†.

Tertullian throws out a bold defiance to the pagan magistrates‡. And again, Tertullian alleges the confession of the *dæmons* themselves as often as they were tormented by the exorcists§. Apolog. c. 23."

V.

"Irenæus asserts likewise the *doctrine of the Millennium, in the grossest sense of it, &c.*—Papias, a disciple of *St. John*, and companion of *Poly-carp*, an ancient man, testifies, &c. || Irenæus, l. v. p. 455.

Irenæus then proceeds to confirm this doctrine by the testimonies of the prophets,

"One of the *grossest images*, respecting the Millennium, may be found in *Irenæus*, the disciple of *Papias*, who had seen the apostle *St. John*. Irenæus, l. v. p. 455.

Most of these pictures were borrowed from a *misrepresentation of Isaiah, Daniel,*

* Page 133.

† Note 74. c. xv.

|| Page 169.

‡ Page 475.

§ Note 38. c. 15.

MIDDLETON.

prophets, *Isaiab, Ezekiël, Daniel, and the Revelations of St. John, &c.*

Justin declares, that all the Christians, who were in all points orthodox, embraced and believed the doctrine of the Millennium;--and was followed in it by the Fathers of the second and third centuries: Yet the doctrine itself was afterwards exploded, as it well deserved, not only as absurd and monstrous, but as impious and heretical†. Justin. Dial. par. ii. p. 313.

In all which, these two Fathers, whose principles I have been illustrating, were implicitly followed, for a century or two at least, by all their successors†.

GIBBON.

Daniel, and the Apocalypse.*

The assurance of a Millennium, was carefully inculcated by a succession of the Fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles, down to Lactantius, who was preceptor to the son of Constantine. The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth, was at first treated as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees, as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was at length rejected as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism§. Justin. Dial. ii. 11.

VI.

Mr. G. finds a passage extracted from Tertullian by Middleton, which he does not hesitate to translate and put in his text.

* Note 62. c. xv.

† Page 179.

‡ Note 63. c. xv.

† Page 155.

§ Page 471.

MIDDLETON.

"*Si Tiberis ascendit ad mania; si Nilus non ascendit in arva; si cælum stetit; terra movit; si fames; si lues; statim, Christianos ad Leonem.*"
Tertull. Apol. 40."

GIBSON.

"If the empire had been afflicted by any recent calamity, by a plague, a famine, or an unsuccessful war; if the Tiber had, or if the Nile had not, risen beyond its banks; if the earth had shaken, or if the temperate order of the seasons had been interrupted, &c. Tertull. Apol. 40†."

VII.

"The divine censure does not cease to chastise us, neither by night, nor by day; for, besides nightly visions, even boys among us are filled with the Holy Ghost †."

See also his words, that "the power of working miracles, was upon their pretended revival, committed not to the bishops, the martyrs, &c. but to boys, to women, and to private and obscure laymen ‡."

"In one of the dialogues, commonly ascribed to Lucian, the Christians seem to be
"ridi-

"The divine inspiration, whether it was conveyed in the form of a waking or of a sleeping vision, is described as a favour very liberally bestowed on all ranks of the faithful, on women as on elders, on boys as well as upon bishops §."

"When their devout minds were sufficiently prepared by a course of prayer, of fasting, and
"of

* See p. 326, 327.

† Page 222.

‡ R. 542. note 60. c. xvi.

§ P. 475.

¶ Page 146.

MIDDLETON.

"ridiculed, on account
 "of their fasting, and
 "& watching whole nights
 "in hymns and prayers,
 "as if they could infuse,
 "by that means, what
 "sort of dreams or vi-
 "sions they "thought
 "fit*."

Athenagoras expressly
 says, "that while they were
 "under the divine im-
 "pulse, they were trans-
 "ported out of their senses, and delivered in ecstasy
 "what was inspired, being mere organs of the
 "holy spirit, just as a pipe or flute is of him
 "who blows into it." Athenagoras Legat. pro
 Christian. §

GIBBON.

"of vigils, to receive the
 "extraordinary impulse,
 "they were transported out
 "of their senses, and deli-
 "vered in ecstasy what
 "was inspired, being
 "mere organs of the holy
 "spirit, just as a pipe or
 "flute is of him who blows
 "into it. Athenagoras in
 "Legatione †."

Besides this we have the following remarkable coincidence of reference :

Middleton says, at this place, "Justin Martyr
 "speaks of them in the same strain," &c. *Cobort.*
ad Gent.—"Tertullian also," &c. *Adv. Mar-*
cion. l. iv.

These quotations Gibbon has accurately transcrib-
 ed into his note 78. c. xv. "Justin Martyr, co-
 "hort. ad Gentes. Tertullian, adv. Marcion.
 "l. iv."

Now what shall we say? Is it probable, I may
 add is it possible, that two persons could translate

* Page 234.

§ Page 237.

† Page 475. note 73. c. xv.

the original Greek so as to answer *verbatim et literatim* in this manner? It is obvious that the above passage was extracted by Mr. G. from Middleton; there is not a single reference but he affords it to him. And though our author does make an observation on Cicero, in a note on this place, we need only turn back a few pages in Middleton, and there we meet with the same thought, and the same reference.

MIDDLETON.

"From these testimonies we may collect, that the *prophecy* of the primitive church by *vision* or *ecstasy*, was of the same kind, as to its outward appearance, with *that divination by fury*, as it was called among the Gentiles, &c. of which Cicero says, in way of raillery, "*what authority can that madness have, which you call divine,*" &c. De Div. ii. 54. †"

GIBBON.

"These descriptions are not very unlike the prophetic fury, for which Cicero expresses so little reverence *." De Divin. ii. 54.

VIII.

It was highly incumbent on Mr. Gibbon to say, that "the learning of *Dodwell*, and the ingenuity of Middleton, have left scarcely any thing to add concerning the merit, the honours, and the motives of the martyrs‡." For if we compare these authors together, we shall find that Mr. G. has not advanced a single thought of his own on

‡ P. 223, 224.

* Note 73. c. xv.

† Note 89. c. xvi.

the subject. See Middleton, page 332. sect. 3.
See Gibbon, page 550, 551.

IX.

MIDDLETON.

Middleton speaks of *Cyprian's heavenly visions*, of his flight and retreat from persecution; that it gave great scandal, especially to some, as appears by the epistle of the clergy of Rome, on this occasion, to the clergy of Carthage; and that it is no wonder to find Cyprian and his apologist Pontius so solicitous to excuse it *.

"Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria," says he, "has said, that in the time of persecution, he was commanded by God in a vision to retire from Alexandria, and was wonderfully preserved by him in his retreat †." Cyprian. Epist. 2. 9. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 40.

GIBBON.

Gibbon says, "Prudence suggested the necessity of a temporary retreat to Cyprian; that his extreme caution did not escape the censure of the more rigid Christians;" and appeals to the polite, but severe, epistle of the clergy of Rome to the bishop of Carthage."

He says also, that "Pontius labours with the greatest care and diligence, to justify his master against the general censure ‡." Cyprian. Epist. 8, 9.

Mr. G. says, that "the example of several holy bishops, and the divine admonitions which, as Cyprian declares himself, he frequently received in visions and ecstasies, were the reasons alleged

* Page 227.

† Page 230.

‡ Note 76. c. xvi.

in his justification *." He appeals, in a note, to the examples of Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neo Cæsarea §. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 40, &c.

X.

Compare what M. says on the Galileans, page 332,—and what G. says of them, p. 536, 537.

XI.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

M. says, "None of these venerable saints have any where affirmed, that they themselves were endued with any power of working miracles," &c. †

G. asks, "Does there exist a single instance of a saint asserting, that he himself possessed the gift of miracles?" &c. †

XII.

Middleton speaking of the Sibylan books, says, "These forged books are frequently cited and applied to the defence of Christianity, by the most eminent Fathers, as true and genuine pieces, and of equal authority with the Scriptures themselves **."

Mr. G. speaking of these spurious books, says, almost in Middleton's words, "These pious forgeries were obtruded on the Gentiles as of equal value with the genuine inspirations of heaven †."

* Page 547.

§ Note 77. c. vii.

† See page 143.

† See

** Page 74.

Compare also p. 153. 157.—with note 191. c. xv.

XIII.

See what M. says of the cure of the emperor Severus by holy oil, &c. Tertullian. ad Scapulam, t. 4. *—And what G. says of healing the sick by the use of oil; and of this cure by Proculus†. Mr. G. also appeals to the epistle of Tertullian to Scapula †.

XIV.

Compare what is said by Dr. M. of the Christians challenging the miraculous powers maintained in the heathen world, p. 201, 202.—and what our author says of the supernatural powers assumed by the church, p. 565. See also his notes 137, 138. c. xvi. of the cures performed at the shrine of Æsculapius.

XV.

Examine what M. says of the progress of the Gospel among the vulgar, and its gaining some few of rank, &c. p. 324, 325.—Also what G. says of the reception it met with among the higher class of people, &c. p. 513—517.

Compare M.'s remark on the words of Suetonius at this place, and his reference to Sueton. in Ner. c. 16.—with the similar remark of G., p. 534. and quotation of Sueton. in Neronæ, t. c. 16. See note 34. c. xvi.

* Page 200.

† Page 557.

‡ Note 107. c. xvi.

XVI.

MIDDLETON.

Translates Tacitus, as saying, that "the Christians were condemned *not so much for their supposed crime of setting fire to the city, as for their hatred of all mankind : and though they deserved the most exemplary punishment,*" &c. Taciti Annales xv. 44. *

GIBBON.

Observe the similarity in G.'s translation, of the same passage, "Their guilt *deserved the most exemplary punishment ;* they were convicted *not so much for the crime of setting fire to the city,* as for their hatred of human-kind." Tacit.† annal. xv. 44.

XVII.

See what is said by Dr. M. on Pliny and his conduct, p. 325. where he cites Plin. Ep. x. 97. —Compare with this our author's words and reference, p. 540. Plin. Ep. x. 97. ‡

XVIII.

Compare what is said in the Free Inquiry, p. 326, 327.—and what we meet with in G. p. 513. 528.

See M. p. 225.—and G. p. 465.

XIX.

See the observation of M. on Tertullian, respecting *flight in persecution*, p. 344.—and the note of G. on this occasion, note 99. c. xvi.

* Page 324, 325.

† Page 533, 534.

‡ Note 56. c. xvi.

XX. Compare

XX.

Compare what is said of the *Afetics*, in Middleton's preface, p. 20.—with what G. says of their origin, &c. p. 485. and note 97. c. xv.

XXI.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

See the remarks of this author on the period to which miracles are to be extended*. That "each succeeding age furnishes miracles and witnesses," &c. that one "supplies a venerable Bede, whose very name carries authority," &c. †

Observe what G. says of this period, that "every age bears testimony to wonderful events, &c. till we are led on to accuse our own inconsistency, if we deny to the venerable Bede, or to the holy Bernard, the same degree of confidence we had so liberally granted to Justin and Irenæus."

XXII.

Compare the remark of Middleton on Lucian. de Mort. Peregrin. p. 144,—and the words of G. p. 481. and note 84. c. xv.

XXIII.

Observe the remark on the Epistles of Ignatius, Middleton, p. 125, 126. and note 1.—and what Gibbon says of them, p. 552. note 92. c. xvi.

* Page 61. Introd. Discourse.

† Page 71. *ibid.* See also vol. ii. p. 59.

XXIV.

XXIV.

See where M. largely dwells on the *purity* of the first ages, p. 74. 76. 79. 80.—See at the same time what G. says of the *virgin purity* of the church, &c. p. 461. 477. 564.

XXV.

MIDDLETON.

Middleton says of the reproach of Celsus; "These artful pretenders, by insinuating themselves chiefly in private houses, or among the ignorant populace, had been able to maintain their ground †," &c. p. 79.

And again, "Celsus," says he, "represents all the Christian workers as mere vagabonds and common cheats, who rambled about to play their tricks at fairs and markets, not in the circles of the wiser and better sort, for among

such they never ventured to appear; but wherever they observed a set of raw young fellows, slaves or fools, there they took care to intrude themselves, and display all their arts. Cecilius

GIBBON.

Mr. G. draws the same picture of the Christians. He says, "whilst they cautiously avoid the dangerous encounter of philosophers, they mingle with the rude and illiterate crowd, and insinuate themselves into those minds whom their age, their sex, or their education, has the best disposed to receive the impression of religious terrors." He had before said, "These obscure teachers are no mute in public as they are loquacious and dogmatical in private †."

† Orig. con. Cels. l. i. p. 8, 9.

† Page 514.

MIDDLETON.

"also calls them a lurking nation, shunning the
"light, *made in public*, prating in corners."

Having given such evident proofs of our author's being greatly indebted to *the Free Inquiry* of Dr. Middleton, we must surely allow, that it was just and grateful in him to speak handsomely of that treatise †. But it would have been still *more just and grateful* in him, if he had *acknowledged* where he had borrowed from him. He has, indeed, sometimes mentioned the name of Middleton; once or twice with an additional remark; but he has never directly owned the assistance he has received from him. We may, however, rest satisfied, that Christianity has little to fear from this fresh attack on *miracles*, when its foe, being stripped of his glittering armour, appears to wield only such weapons as have been already blunted and shattered against its repelling shield.

Instances of Plagiarism from BARBEYRAC.

As our author found the *Free Inquiry* of Middleton very useful to him on the subject of miracles; so, with regard to *the morality of the Fathers*, Barbeyrac's treatise has proved a source of infor-

* Page 144.

† Mr. G. says, (p. 476.) "The miracles of the primitive church, after obtaining the sanction of ages, have been lately attacked in a very *free and ingenious inquiry*, which though it has met with the *most favourable reception*, from the public, appears to have excited a general scandal among the divines of our own, as well as of the other Protestant churches of Europe."

†

mation

mation equally fruitful; and, as Barbeyrac has drawn rather a dark and dismal picture of the earliest Christian writers, by selecting and exposing their blemishes; to copy his remarks, in preference to those of other writers less prejudiced on the subject, admirably suited the purpose of Mr. Gibbon.

He has indeed, with great propriety, given us a general reference or two to the treatise *De la Morale des Pères*; but as the particular passages which he has servilely extracted from that work are very numerous, it would have been too humiliating a task to have required of our diligent and accurate historian, who consults only original materials, an exact and faithful acknowledgment of all his obligations to the Dutch professor.

I shall introduce the following extracts by observing, that Barbeyrac thus speaks of the origin of the mistaken notions of the Fathers, with regard to the unlawfulness of pleasure; and that our author discovers the same source for their opinions on this subject.

I.

BARBEYRAC.

“ Remontons à la première origine de toutes ces fausses idées.—On se figuroit les plaisirs les plus naturels, comme ayant quelque chose de mauvais en eux-mêmes; & la permission, que Dieu donnoit de les goûter, comme une

GIBBON.

Our devout predecessors, vainly aspiring to imitate the perfections of angels, disdained, or affected to disdain, every earthly and corporeal delight.

The first sensation of pleasure was marked as the

BARBEYRAC.

une espèce de *tolerance*, & d'*indulgence*, à laquelle l'*infirmité humaine* l'avoit forcé en quelque manière pour éviter un *plus grand mal* *."

" De là est née la vie monastique : de là tant d'austeritez & de mortifications inutiles : de là ces vœux de Célibat, si témérairement formez, & qui, étant mal gardez, ont produit tant des *désordres*," &c. ||

GIBBON.

the first moment of their abuse †.

" Such are the early traces of monastic principles and institutions, which, in a subsequent age, have counter-balanced all the temporal advantages of Christianity †."

II.

" Les Pères vouloient faire entendre que les *secondes* & *troisièmes* noces ne pouvoient plus avoir une véritable ressemblance au mariage de *Jésus-Christ* avec son *Eglise*, qui est le grand modèle des mariages *Chrétiens*.

" The sensual connexion was refined into a resemblance of the mystic union of *Christ* with his church, and was pronounced to be indissoluble either by divorce or by death **."

" Que le noeud du mariage soit indissoluble,—le droit canon n'excep^te pas même le cas d'*adultère*, &c. §

* C. iv. sect. 34. 4to edit. Amsterdam, 1728.

† Page 483.

|| Sect. 35.

‡ Page 485.

§ Sect. 36. See also sect. 10.

** Page 484, 485.

BAR:

III.

BARBEYRAC.

"Chacun de nous," dit
ATHENAGORAS, (Legat.
cap. 28.) "ou demeure tel
qu'il est venu au monde,
ou ne se marie qu'une
fois. Car les secondes
noces sont une honte
NETE ADULTERE †."

GIBBON.

"The practice of se-
cond nuptials was brand-
ed with the name of legal
adultery &c."

IV.

"ATHENAGORAS pré-
tend ailleurs que "le cé-
libat unit d'avantage les
hommes avec Dieu."
Si cela est, comme cha-
cun doit ne rien negli-
ger de ce qui peut entre-
tenir ou augmenter son
union avec Dieu, abstenir
devra aussi aspirer au cé-
libat."

"Since desire was im-
puted as a crime, and
marriage was tolerated
as a defect, it was con-
sistent with the same
principles to consider a
state of celibacy as the
nearest approach to the
divine perfection."

ib. 2 p. iv. fol. 6, p. 29.

§. Page 485. Mr. G. in a note (91. c. xv.) on this place
says, "See a chain of tradition from Justin Martyr to Jerome in
the *Morale des Pères*, c. iv. 6—26." Yet willing to make
his reader believe that he had himself consulted the original au-
thors, he transcribes the references of BARBEYRAC in the notes
which he subjoins: Then, for a proof of his assertion that "the
primitive church was filled with a great number of persons of
either sex, who had devoted themselves to the profession of
perpetual chastity," he quotes, at note 93. c. xv. "Athe-
nagoras in Legat. c. 28. Minucius Felix, c. 31. and Justin,"
&c.—In such a general reflection they must all agree, but this
particular part of Athenagoras and of Minucius Felix would have
been more judiciously quoted at note 91. or 89, 90. l. xv.
where Mr. G. introduces the subject on which Barbeyrac has
quoted them. But our author has altered the arrangement, lest
we should discover that he has transcribed these references from
the *Morale des Pères*.

V.

V.

BARBEYRAC.

"Minucius Felix dit,
qu' "un Chrétien ou ne se
marie jamais, ou ne se
marie qu'une fois."

Part of his note on
this passage is,

—"Cupiditatem pro-
creandi aut unam sci-
mus, aut nullam." c. 31.

GIBBON.

"The primitive church
was filled with a great
number of persons of
either sex, who had
devoted themselves to
the profession of *perpetual chastity*."

His note is,

"Cupiditatem procre-
andi aut unam scimus, aut
nullam." Minucius Fel-
ix, c. 31, &c.

VI.

"Le chapitre iv. (de
l'ouvrage de CLEMENT
d'Alexandrie, qui a pour
titre le Pédagogue) en-
seigne, comment on peut
se réjouir dans les Fêles.
CLEMENT en bannit tout
instrument de musique, &
toute chanson *," &c.

"Clement commence
le ii. (livre) par prescrire
la qualité & la quantité
des alimens, dont on doit
user.—Pour ce qui est
de l'usage légitime des
alimens & de la Boisson,
il le borne si fort à ce
que demande la conser-
vation de nôtre vie, qu'il
exclut toute vuë de
plaisir.—Il met au rang
des

"The unfeeling can-
didate for heaven was
instructed not only to
resist the grosser allure-
ments of the taste or
smell, but even to shut
his ears against the pro-
fane harmony of sounds,
and to view with indif-
ference the most finished
productions of human
art. Gay apparel, mag-
nificent houses, and ele-
gant furniture, were sup-
posed to unite the double
guilt of pride and sen-
suality: a simple and
mortified appearance was
more suitable to the
Christian who was cer-
tain of his sins and
doubtful

BARBEYRAC.

des excès de bouche condamnables, l'usage du *pain blanc* : c'est, dit-il, "*effeminer & tourner un aliment nécessaire en op-probre de volupté* *."

" Il blâme sans distinction tous ceux qui font venir des *vins agreables de quelque Païs étranger*," &c.—" Il passe de là † aux *vases, & autres meubles, dont il fait une longue énumération. Il condamne absolument tout ce qui est d'or, d'argent, ou de quelque autre matière, dont l'emploi n'est pas nécessaire pour les besoins de la vie ‡.*" &c.

" *Clement règle le tems du Sommeil, & la manière dont on doit se coucher §. Il ne veut rien ici de précieux, ni de mou. Il tourne en exemple à imiter par obligation, ce que JACOB fit par nécessité : & il dit, que ce Patriarche fut jugé digne d'une vision céleste, pendant qu'il avoit une Pierre pour oreiller ||.*"

GIBBON.

doubtful of his salvation. In their censures of luxury, the Fathers are extremely minute and circumstantial ; and among the various articles which excite their pious indignation, we may enumerate *false hair, garments of any colour except white, instruments of music, vases of gold or silver, downy pillows (as Jacob reposed his head on a stone) white bread, foreign wines, public salutations, the use of warm baths, and the practice of shaving the beard*, which, according to the expression of *Tertullian*, is a lie against our own faces, and an impious attempt to improve the works of the Creator. *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23. *Clement Alexandrin. Pædagog.* l. iii. c. 8."

* C. v. sect. 13.

† Chap. iii.

‡ Sect. xiv. p. 48.

§ Chap. ix.

|| Sect. xvii. p. 50.

BARBEYRAC.

“ Il condamne ici absolument toute *teinture d'Etoffes*.—Il n'y a que le *Blanc*, qui convienne à la *candeur* du Chrétien :—Il défend de porter aucun *or*, aucunes *Perles*, aucunes *Pierreries* *.”

“ Il continue, à *censurer en détail les excès* ou les *Femmes* tombent sur cette article †.”

“ De là il vient aux *Hommes* ‡, & non content de blamer en eux tout ce qui a quelque chose d'*effeminé*, il va jusqu'à *taxer de crime ceux qui se font raser la barbe*. Il y trouve même de l'*impiété*, &c. §—Il revient aux *bains*, dont il condamne tout usage ¶, point de *Bains chauds*; parce, dit il, qu'il y a d'autres moïens de se rechauffer.

“ Il traite de *grande impiété l'usage* des faux-cheveux, &c. **

“ Il ne veut pas, que les Chrétiens *se saluent en vuë*, comme si c'étoit *une liberté* inséniée,” &c.

It is now plain beyond a doubt, that Mr. G.'s description of the severe morality of the Fathers, is servilely copied, from what Barbeyrac had extracted from Clemens; though he has *cited*, and

* Sect. 18.

† Livre iii. c. ii.

‡ Dans le chap. iii.

§ Sect. 20. I before promised to inform my reader whence Mr. G. had borrowed this observation, respecting *the impiety of shaving the beard*, and I doubt not but he will be satisfied that it was from Barbeyrac; who, as he quotes in this page *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23, and is treating of *Clemens Alexandrin*, l. iii. c. 3. in this particular section, might readily furnish our author with his references to *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23. and *Clemens Alexandrin*. l. iii. c. 8.

¶ Chap. ix.

** It is observed, p. 120, 121. that this custom is condemned by Cyprian, and by *Tertullian de cultu Femin.* c. 6, 7. p. 156. 157.

would persuade us, that he has consulted, "a work
"of Clemens of Alexandria entitled the *Pedagogue* *;"
and has made a different arrangement from that
in Barbeyrac, in hopes of disguising the plagiarism.

VII.

BARBEYRAC.

"Tertullien condamne
absolument tout métier,
toute profession, tout com-
merce qui regarde des
choses dont les payens
peuvent faire quelque usage
pour des actes d'idolâtrie;
quand même on n'au-
roit pas d'autre moyen de
subsister †." *Traité de*
l'Idolâtrie, c. 11, 12.

GIBBON.

"It was the first but
arduous duty of a Chris-
tian to preserve himself
pure and undefiled by
the practice of idolatry.
Every art and every trade
that was in the least con-
cerned in the framing or
adorning of idols, was pol-
luted by the stain of idola-
try ‡." *Tertullian de Ido-*
latria, c. 10. & 11.

VIII.

"Faut il s'étonner,
après cela, si Tertullien
regarde la vie militaire
comme absolument in-
compatible avec les
règles de l'Evangile." §

"Il est vrai qu'il
semble (de coron. milit.
c. 11.) ailleurs permettre
la profession des armes
à ceux

"The Christians were
not less averse to the
business than to the plea-
sures of this world ||, &c.

"Some indulgence
might perhaps be allow-
ed to those persons who,
before their conversion,
were already engaged in
such violent and sanguina-
ry

* Note 87, c. xv.

† C. vi. sect. 5.

‡ P. 464. and notes 39. 45. c. xv.

§ Sect. 6.

|| P. 485, 486.

BARBEYRAC.

à ceux qui y étoient déjà engagés avant leur bapême *."

" L'Apologie du Christianisme n'en demandoit pas davantage, quelle que fût l'opinion de Tertullien. Bien loin de là : s'il eut insinué, que l'Evangile défendoit de porter les armes, il auroit lui-même donné lieu aux Païens d'accuser les Chrétiens d'être de mauvais sujets, qui refusoient d'aller à la guerre, même pour la défense de l'Etat †."

" Il faut dire la même chose du crime que Tertullien trouve dans plusieurs autres choses, hors de la guerre, comme à orner la porte de sa maison de lampes & de lauriers, dans une réjouissance publique or-

GIBBON.

ary occupations." Tertullian, de Corona militis, c. 11 ‡, &c.

" This indolent, or even criminal, disregard to the public welfare, exposed them to the contempt and reproaches of the pagans, who very frequently asked what must be the fate of the empire, attacked on every side by the barbarians, if all mankind should adopt the pusillanimous sentiments of the new sect §."

" Some idea may be conceived of the abhorrence of the Christians for such impious ceremonies, by the scrupulous delicacy which they displayed on a much less alarming occasion. On days of general festivity, it was the custom of the ancients to adorn their doors

* Sect. 8.

† Sect. 7.

‡ Mr. G. constantly finds some expedient to disguise his plagiarism; thus he does not make this reference immediately after writing the sentence borrowed from Barbeyrac, but in the following one (at note 100.) and makes some addition to the note, to have the honour of calling it his own.

§ P. 486. *Origin*, l. viii. p. 423. is referred to, note 101. c. xv. I shall account for this shortly.

BARBEYRAÇ.

donnée par le Prince. La raison, qu'il en donne, est, que les Payens reconnoissoient & adoroient de fausses divinitez, ou des démons, comme presidant aux portes & aux portaux des maisons." De Idolat. c. xv. *

" Il est faux d'ailleurs, que,—après Tertullien, toutes sortes de couronnes, & principalement celles de laurier, contre lesquelles il déclame, eussent du rapport à l'idolatrie. Quoi que le LAURIER fut regardé par les Payens, comme un arbre consacré à APOLLON, ou à BACCHUS, il n'en suit nullement de là, que, toutes les fois, qu'on mettoit sur sa tête, une couronne de laurier, on la prit en vuë de cette consecration religieuse †."

GIBBON.

doors with lamps and with branches of laurel, and to crown their heads with a garland of flowers. This innocent and elegant practice might perhaps have been tolerated as a mere civil institution. But it most unluckily happened, that the doors were under the protection of the household gods, that the laurel was sacred to the lover of Daphne, and that garlands of flowers, though frequently worn either as a symbol of joy or mourning, had been dedicated in their first origin to the service of superstition ‡." Tertul. de Idol.

" Tertullian has composed a rash defence, or rather panegyric, of the rash action of a Christian soldier, who, by throwing away his crown of laurel, had exposed himself and his brethren to the most imminent danger §."

* Sect. 11.

† Sect. 17. c. vi. This is particularly applied to the soldiers on account of their attendance at these idolatrous ceremonies at sect. 9.

‡ Page 465, 466.

§ Note 49. c. xv.

Our author, in confirmation of some of these remarks, has cited *Origen contra Celsum* as follows; l. v. p. 253. l. vii. p. 348. l. viii. p. 423—428*. I appeal to the reader if we can otherwise account for his having pointed out not only the same passages, but even the very same pages, which, we shall see Barbeyrac has done; than by supposing that he has transcribed his references. We shall see also that he is furnished hence with his references to Tertullian.

BARBEYRAC.

“ C’est ainsi qu’il a toujours regardé la profession militaire, comme interdite aux Chrétiens. Il (*Origen*) se déclare là-dessus, de la manière la plus forte, à la fin de son traité contre *CELSE*, où il dit, que “ les Chrétiens se contentent de prier DIEU pour l’Empereur, mais qu’ils ne portent point les armes pour lui, quand même il voudroit les y contraindre, lib. viii. p. 427.” † Il condamne, un

GIBBON.

“ It was acknowledged that, under a less perfect law, the powers of the Jewish constitution had been exercised, with the approbation of heaven, by inspired prophets, and by anointed kings. *The Christians felt and confessed, that such institutions might be necessary for the present system of the world, and they cheerfully submitted to the authority of their pagan governors.* But while they inculcated

* Note 99. c. xv.

† Ημῶν ἢ μᾶλλον, &c.

Lactantius is cited as corroborating this opinion; *Instit. Divin.* l. vi. c. 20. & seqq. by Barbeyrac c. ix. § 3. and is appealed to by Mr. G. (at Note 26.) *Institut. Divin.* l. vi. c. 20, 2, 22.

BARBEYRAC.

un peu plus bas, l'exercice de tout magistrature: & ailleurs il rend raison, à sa manière, de la différence qu'il y a, selon lui, à cet égard, entre les Juifs, & les Chrétiens. Lib. v. p. 253. lib. vii. p. 348. 349.

“ C'est le même système, que Tertullien, & autres Pères, se sont fait ici. Ils croioient que les Magistratures, & les guerres, étoient nécessaires, pour l'entretien de la Société Civile, & la défense des peuples. Ainsi ils en tenoient l'usage légitime par rapport aux anciens Juifs, & aux Païens, mais non pas pour cela par rapport aux Chrétiens, à qui ils s'imaginoient que l'Evangile le défendoit †.”

“ Tertullien—condamne absolument la recherche &

GIBBON.

cated the maxims of passive obedience, they refused to take any active part in the civil administration, or the military defence of the empire,—it was impossible that Christians, without renouncing a more sacred duty, could assume the character of soldiers, of magistrates, or of princes *.” Tertullian. Apolog c. 21. de Idololatria c. 17, 18.

“ Their simplicity was offended by the use of oaths, by the pomp of magistracy, and by the active contention of public life, nor could their humane ignorance be convinced, that it was lawful on any occasion to shed the blood of our fellow creatures either by the sword of justice or by that of war; even though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace and safety of the whole community †”

* Page 486. Tertullian is referred to by Mr. G. in the preceding part of this sentence, note 99. c. xv.

† Page 486. Mr. G. here very concisely says, in a note (98. c. xv.) *See the Morale des Pères,* &c.

‡ Chap. 7. p. 104. Note 1.

BARBEYRAC.

l'exercice des emplois publics, surtout de ceux qui imposent la nécessité de condamner à mort les criminels. “ On demande, (dit Tertullien) “ Si un “ serviteur de DIEU peut se charger de quelque “ dignité, ou de quelque magistrature,” &c. * de idol. c. 17. 18.

Barbeyrac then enumerates *the almost insurmountable difficulties*, as Mr. G. calls them, and proceeds with this remark :

Tertullien met en ce rang non seulement l'obligation de *faire serment* †, dont il semble condamner entièrement l'usage : mais encore la nécessité de *juger dans les cas où il s'agit de la vie ou de l'honneur, de prononcer quelque sentence de condamnation ou de faire des loix qui l'autorisent, d'ordonner qu'on met quelqu'un aux fers, ou en prison, ou à la torture : toutes choses, qu'il suppose par la manifestation être incompatibles avec la qualité de Chrétien ‡.*

“ Ce Pere, dit, que le seul appareil des marques de dignité qui sont attachées aux charges publiques, les doit faire fuir à un Chrétien, comme des choses *originellement consacrées à l'idolatrie* : outre qu'on les emploie aussi en l'honneur des idoles §.” de Idol. c. 18.

“ Il n'y a sujet de s'étonner, que Tertullien ait regardé comme *incompatibles*, la qualité d'Empereur, & celle de Chrétien ||.

* Sect. 21.

† See also c. ii. sect. 5, 15. where Justin is represented as teaching the same doctrine; and c. iii. sect. 6. the same is said of Irenæus.

‡ Sect. 22.

§ Sect. 24.

|| Sect. 26.

IX.

BARBEYRAC.

See what this author says further on the above subject, and his remarks on the apology of Tertullian, respecting the information of Pontius Pilate given to Tiberius, of the unjust death of Jesus, and the conduct of that emperor on the occasion*. I shall extract some of the more striking passages.

"Tibère, selon que l'assure Tertullien, reconnut dans son cœur la divinité de Jésus-Christ, il alla même jusqu'à proposer sa croiance au sénat," &c.

Et n'ayant pu lui persuader de mettre Jésus-Christ au nombre des divinités reconnues par autorité publique, il se réduisit à défendre, sous menaces de son indignation, de dénoncer les Chrétiens pour être punis comme tels."

"Il y a, dit M. Dupin, plusieurs savans, *qui*

GIBBON.

Compare this with the words of Mr. G. respecting the *suspicious instance contained in Tertullian's apology*; that "*Pontius Pilate informed the emperor of the unjust sentence of death, which he had pronounced against an innocent, and, as it appeared, a divine person; and that Tiberius immediately conceived the design of placing the Jewish Messiah among the gods of Rome; that his servile senate ventured to disobey the commands of their master; that Tiberius, instead of resenting their refusal, contented himself with protecting the Christians from the severity of the laws* §," &c.

"The first of these examples," (that is, the edict

BARBEYRAC.

qui doutent de la vérité de cette histoire, qui dans le fond à très-peu de vraisemblance. Car quelle apparence, que PILATE écrivît à Tibère ces choses d'un homme qu'il avoit

condamné à mort ? Et, quand il les lui auroit écrites, est-il vraisemblable que TIBÈRE eût proposé au sénat, de mettre cette homme au nombre des dieux, sur la simple relation d'un gouverneur ? Et s'il l'eût proposé, qui peut douter que le sénat ne se put aussi tôt rendu à son sentiment * ? ”

GIBBON.

edict of Tiberius) “ is attended with some difficulties which might perplex a sceptical mind † . ”

X.

“ Tertullien dit, que c'est le diable qui chauffe les brodequins aux acteurs.—La vanité seule étoit leur principe ; le désir de paroître d'une stature grande & majestueuse lors qu'ils représentoient le personnage de quelques Héros, leur faisoit emprunter de l'art, ce que la nature leur avoit refusé ‡ . ”

“ Sic

“ The Christian, with pious horror avoided the abomination of the circus, or the theatre § . ”

Mr. G. here adds this note :

“ See Tertullian. de Spectaculis. This severe reformer shews no more indulgence to a tragedy of Euripides, than to a combat of gladiators. The dress of the

* Sect. 29.

† Page 556. My reader should be told that Mr. G. does not refer to Barbeyrac at this place. I would point out likewise his singular expression, “ We are *required* to believe,” &c. as if this were an article of the Christian faith ; and, no doubt, he meant it was *sufficiently superstitious* to deserve a place in our creed.

‡ Sect. 20. p. 81.

§ Page 464.

BARBEYRAC.

" Sic et tragœdos co-
 " thurnis extulit (diabo-
 " lus) quia nemo potest ad-
 " jicere cubitum unum ad
 " staturam suam. Men-
 " dacem facere vult
 " Christum." De Spec-
 " taculis, cap. 23 *.

GIBBON.

the actors particularly
 offends him; *by the use*
of the lofty buskin, they
impiously strive to add a
cubit to their stature,"
 c. 23 †.

XI.

" On peut dire la
 même chose de la con-
 damnation de la fuite
 en tems de persécution.
Tertullien a dé-
veloppé, et poussé de
toute sa force dans de
livre qu'il fit tout exprès
là dessus, étant Monta-
niste, cette opinion ri-
gide et fausse, dont on
voit l'ébauche dans les
ouvrages écrits avant sa
séparation §," &c.

" Tertullian considers
 flight from persecution,
 as an imperfect, but
 very criminal, apostacy,
 as an impious attempt to
 elude the will of God,
 &c. &c. He has writ-
 ten a treatise on this
 subject, which is filled
 with the wildest fanati-
 cism, and the most in-
 coherent declamation ¶."

XII.

" A l'égard des ma-
 nières de parler usitées,
 qui ont quelque rapport à
 l'idolâtrie, il n'est pas
 vrai, que, *Tertullien*
n'en trouve l'usage mau-
vais,

" Even the common
 language of Greece and
 Rome abounded with
 familiar but impious ex-
 pressions, which the im-
 prudent Christian might
 too

* Note 2.

† Note 41. c. xv.

§ Sect. 31. p. 89.

¶ Note 99. c. xvi.

BARREYRAC.

vois, qu'autant que nous contribuons par là au culte des idoles. Il permet seulement quelques-uns de ces expressions : mais en même tems il en condamne d'autres, qui ne sont pas plus mauvaises." — pour-quoi, en parlant d'*Esculape*, d'*Isis*, de *Jupiter*, &c. ne pourra-t-on pas les appeller *Dieux*, sans ajouter aussitôt quelque chose par où l'on déclare expressément qu'on les tient pour faux ? C'est néanmoins ce que *Tertullien* défend." De Idololatr. c. 20, &c. *

GIBBON.

too carelessly utter, or too patiently bear †." Tertullian de Idololatria, c. 20, 21, 22.

" If a pagan friend used the familiar expression of "*Jupiter blest you*," the Christian was obliged to protest against the divinity of Jupiter ‡."

XIII.

" *Tertullien* rapporte un mot, d'un Proconsul d'*Asie*, qui, las de condamner à mort les *Chrétiens* d'une ville de sa province, qui venoient en foule se déclarer à lui ce qu'ils étoient ; apres en avoir envoié quelques-uns au supplice, dit aux autres : "*Hé malheureux ! si vous voulez sans mourir, n'avez-*
" vous

" *Unhappy men*," exclaimed the proconsul Antoninus to the Christians of Asia, "*unhappy men, if you are thus weary of your lives, is it so difficult for you to find ropes and precious* §." Tertullian ad Scapul. c. 5. ¶.

Compare also what Mr. G. says, of " their impatient zeal, that they rushed

* Sect. 15. p. 78.

† Note 47. c. xv.

‡ Note 95. c. xvi.

† Page 565.

§ Page 552.

BARBEYRAC.

"vous pas des précipices,
 "ou des cordes?" ad Sca-
 pul. cap. ult. *

GIBBON.

*rushed in crowds round the
 tribunal of the magistrates;
 and that the proconsul,
 having condemned a few,
 dismissed the rest."*

XIV.

Mr. G. has extended the remarks which Barbeyrac, in the words of Le Clerc †, makes on the conduct of Cyprian, to other bishops. Some of the sentences, which bear a great similarity, I have extracted.

"Cyprien soutient, qu'il n'y a dans l'Eglise qu'un seul Pontiffe, & qu'un seul Juge, *etabli pour un tems en la place de Jesus Christ*. Après le jugement de Dieu, ajoute-t-il, après le suffrage du peuple, après le consentement des autres évêques, personne ne se rendroit juge, je ne dirai pas d'un évêque, mais de Dieu. —Notre martyr, irrité par les schismatiques, ne se possède presque pas, des qu'il tombe sur cette matière, & oublie

"The prelates of the third century—exalted the unity and power of the church, as it was represented in the *Episcopal Office*:—It was the episcopal authority alone which was derived from the Deity, and extended itself over this, and over another world. *The bishops were the vicegerents of Christ, &c.* ‡;—covering their ambition with the fair pretence of the love of order, they were jealous of any rival in the exercise of discipline, &c.

"From

* Sect. 8. p. 18.

† Le Clerc. Bibl. Univer. tom. xii. p. 308, &c. suiv.

This reference gave our author a fair opportunity of citing Le Clerc.

‡ P. 491. 492.

BARBEYRAC.

blie souvent les règles du bon raisonnement, de même que celles de la bienséance, comme lorsqu'il dit dans la même lettre, " Qu'il n'est pas de la dignité ni de la majesté de l'Eglise Catholique, de s'informer de ce que l'audace des hérétiques & des schismatiques entreprend." *Un sénateur Romain n'aurait pas parlé avec plus de gravité de la Majesté de l'empire ; mais il faut avouer que l'humilité & la douceur du Christianisme n'éclatent pas beaucoup dans ces paroles.*

—St. Cyprien applique à ceux qui se rébellent contre les évêques, divers passages de l'Ecriture sainte touchant les orgueilleux, & ceux qui s'élevoient contre les Sacrificateurs de l'ancienne loi." *

See also c. vii. sect.

4. 8.

GIBBON.

" From the imperious declamations of Cyprian, we should naturally conclude, that it was much less dangerous for the disciples of Christ to neglect the observance of the moral duties, than to despise the censures and authority of their bishops. Sometimes we might imagine, that we were listening to the voice of Moses, when he commanded the earth to open and to swallow up, in consuming flames, the rebellious race which refused obedience to the priesthood of Aaron ; and we should sometimes suppose that we heard a Roman consul asserting the majesty of the republic, and declaring his inflexible resolution to enforce the rigour of the laws †."

See also p. 501, 502.

* C. viii. sect. 47.

† Page 501.

XV.

BARBEYRAC.

See what this author says on *celibacy*, and the disorders that accrue from its being held in esteem, p. 116.

Also his remarks on those women who, professing continency, cohabited with men, yet maintained their chastity to be still unpolluted; and that this custom was forbid by several councils*.

GIBSON.

Compare with this the account of Mr. G. that "the virgins of Africa permitted priests and deacons to share their bed, and gloried amidst the flames in their unsullied purity; and of the scandal introduced by this custom into the church †."

XVI.

"Quelle prise, surtout, l'orgueil n'a-t-il pas, dans le cœur de gens qui se flattent d'une perfection extraordinaire, par laquelle ils se croient fort élevez au dessus du commun des Chrétiens? L'esprit de domination sur les consciences, ou le trouve-t-on, si ce n'est chez ces prêtres & ces reclus, qui ont renoncé au mariage?" ‡

"It was consistent with the same principles to consider a state of celibacy as the nearest approach to the divine perfection.

"The loss of sensual pleasure was supplied and compensated by spiritual pride §."

* C. viii. Sect. 26.

‡ P. 118, 119.

† Page 485.

§ Page 485.

XVII.

XVII.

BARBEYRAC.

GIBBON.

Read what this writer says on the toleration of paganism, and the reason he assigns for the Romans having persecuted the Christians; also his reflection on the mutual persecutions of the Christians. See c. xii. p. 191. &c.

Compare what Mr. G. tells us of the universal toleration of polytheism, and the reasons he assigns for the persecution of the Christians by the Romans; and "the melancholy truth," he mentions, "that the Christians have inflicted far greater severities on each other, than they had

experienced from the zeal of infidels." See p. 519, 520. 523. 585.

XVIII.

See what is said on *vigils*, and their *abuse*, c. xv. § 20, 21. "Cet abus s'augmenta si fort, que le concile d'ELVIRE fut obligé de défendre aux femmes d'aller la nuit dans les cimetières," &c. Canon. 35. See also § 22.

Part of note 22, in the xvth chapter, is, "The 35th canon of the council of Illiberis provides against the scandals which too often polluted the *vigils* of the church."

XX.

"Les premiers Chrétiens à la vérité s'assembloient de nuit; mais c'étoit par nécessité, à cause des persécutions, qui ne leur permettoient pas de le faire de jour.

Mais,

"The precautions with which the disciples of Christ performed the offices of religion, were at first dictated by fear and necessity; but they were continued from choice.

By

BARBEYRAC.

Mais, sous les empe-
reurs Chrétiens, *cette*
coutume, comme plusieurs
autres, s'introduisit, par
une imitation du paga-
nisme; d'où sortoient un
grand nombre de Chre-
tiens." c. xv. p. 258.

GIBBON.

By *imitating* the awful
secrécy which reigned in
the Eleusinian mysteries,
the Christians had flat-
tered themselves, that
they should render their
sacred institutions more
respectable in the eyes
of the pagan world."
p. 527.

XX.

Barbeyrac speaks of
the very insipid and
strange allegories of the
Fathers, c. vii. p. 95.—
104. and *the pious frauds*
made use of by them,
p. 82.

Mr. G.'s expressions
are, "*their affected con-*
ceits and cold allegories,
p. 517. *pious deception*,
and *pious forgeries*, note
59. c. xv.

XXI.

Lastly, I shall point out their similar remarks on
the conduct of the holy martyr *Ignatius*.

"Louons le zèle en
lui-même, & contentons
nous d'excuser ce qui a
eu besoin d'indulgence.
Il n'y a pas moien de re-
garder autrement ces in-
stances véhémentes que
faisoit *Ignace* au *Romains*,
de ne pas travailler,
quand il les en prioit
lui-même, à le garantir
du supplice, *comme si*
par là ils lui envioient la
couronne

"The epistles which
Ignatius composed as he
was carried in chains
through the cities in
Asia, breathe sentiments
the most repugnant to
the ordinary feelings of
human nature. He
earnestly beseeches the Ro-
mans, that when he
should be exposed in
the amphitheatre, they
would not, by their kind,
but

BARBÉYRAC.

*étrouffée du martyre ; ces exhortations à flatter les bêtes féroces, afin qu'elles le dévorassent entièrement ; ce dessein où il témoigne être de les irriter lui-même, de peur qu'elles ne le respectassent, comme il étoit arrivé à quelques confesseurs *,"* Romanos, c. 4, 5. p. 27, &c.

GIBBON.

but unseasonable intercession, deprive him of the crown of glory ; and he declares his resolution to provoke and irritate the wild beasts which might be employed as the instruments of his death †." Epist. ad Roman. c. 4, 5. ap. Patres Apostol. tom. ii. p. 27.

I have now traced, at a great length, the passages in Barbéyrac from which our author appears to have collected many of his observations ; the greater part of them, as we have seen, relate to the morality of the Fathers. But surely his second-hand reflexions can no more impair or vilify their conduct, than his former stale objections to miracles can prejudice the truth of Christianity. It argues indeed no small degree of presumption in Mr. Gibbon, to think that his engaging language will atone for obtruding on the world, as his own, these antiquated censures of the Fathers, the severity of many of which can be exceeded only by their injustice.

Instances of Plagiarism from DAILLE'.

The mode in which Barbéyrac has treated the writings of the Fathers, is very different from that

* C. viii. sect. 37.

† P. 552. note 92. c. xvi.

in which Daillé has pointed out *their use* †; who as a generous opponent, and as a good Christian, with regret exposed the failings and errors of such truly venerable men, while he takes every opportunity of pointing out the excellencies of their works, and the claim they have to our esteem and credit *. Our author, therefore, could not expect to find so much that suited his purpose, in the treatise of Daillé: Yet I shall now shew, though he has quoted it but once, and that only in his third edition †, that he is obliged to it for several remarks, which he has not been candid enough to acknowledge. Middleton and Barbeyrac have been equally forgetful of their obligations to the same author.

I.

DAILLÉ.

GIBBON.

<p>“ Ego (inquit Justinus) “ & qui per omnia rectè “ sentiunt Christiani, & “ carnis resurrectionem “ futuram novimus, & “ mille annos in urbe Hieru-</p>	<p>“ The testimony of Justin, of his own faith and that of his orthodox brethren in the doctrine of a Millennium, is deliver- ed in the clearest and most</p>
---	---

† I have made use of the Latin translation of Daillé's *Use of the Fathers*.

* “ Ægre quidem, et, quod ait poeta ἀλκοντι θυμῷ, hanc disputationis partem aggredior. Grave enim est, & à pudore nostro alienum, hominum, præsertim sanctorum & merito venerabilium, nævos ac labe spectare ac ostentare,” p. 253.

“ Itaque etiam si patribus defuisset summa illa ingenii atque eruditionis excellentia qua atheos faciliè superarunt, illorum tamen vel nudæ voces horum testimonio essent anteponendæ. Apparet enim & horum contra Christianam veritatem judicium odii merito suspectum esse; & illorum de Christi & evangelii divinitate voces ab omni studio puras & immunes esse.”

See also his encomiums on the Fathers, p. 356. 363. &c.

† See note 64. c. xvi. 3d edition.

DAILLÉ.

GIBBON.

"*Hierusalem instaura-
ta agendos.*"

"His verbis omnes suo tempore catholicos in eo errore versatos, soloque hæreticos ab eo alienos fuisse testatur. Scio ipsum supra dixisse, *multos esse qui sunt in pia & pura Christianorum sententia qui hoc non agnoscunt.* Verum hæc adeo discrepantia conciliet qui potest. *Omnes qui recta sentiunt, sunt in ea opinione, & multi qui recta sentiunt sunt ab ea opinione alieni.* Inquirat etiam, cui vacabit, an nullum sit in Justinii codicibus mendum *." Justin. contr. Tryphon. p. 306.

"Quod si ad secula inferiora descendas—Hieronimus scribit hoc delirium a multis receptum fuisse, & ad superiores, quos jam nominavimus, Lactantium addit," &c. p. 288. See also p. 255, &c.

II.

"Cyprianus quidem docet ecclesiam sui temporis magnam variis in locis

most solemn manner (Dialog. cum Tryphonte Jud. p. 177, 178. edit. Benedictin.) *If in the beginning of this important passage there is any thing like an inconsistency, we may impute it, as we think proper, either to the author, or to his transcribers †.*"

"The assurance of such a Millennium was carefully inculcated by a succession of the Fathers, from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, down to Lactantius," p. 471.

Justin. contr. Tryphon.

"The deliberations of the provincial councils were assisted by the advice

* Page 287.

† Note 65. c. xv. 3d edit. Daillé is not appealed to in this note.

DAILLE',

GIBBON.

locis ejus rationem habuisse, adeo ut *nihil quod esset alicujus momenti absque fidelium sententia gereretur*, ut in ejus epistolis videre est. Certè quæstio de baptismo hæreticorum, de qua supra nonnihil jam diximus, in synodo, Carthagine, *præ-*
sente etiam plebis maxima parte agitata fuit." p. 195.

advice of a few distinguished presbyters, and moderated by the presence of a listening multitude †. Acta Concil. Carthag apud Cyprian, *præsentē plebis maximā parte *.*"

III,

"Hujus (*Tertulliani*) unicus admirator Cyprianus, ut etiam eum, propter excellentiam, *magistrum vocitare soleret* †," &c.

Dailé here gives us the following note :

"*Hieron. l. de Script. Eccl. in Tertull. t. i. p. 365. Vidi ego quendam Paulum—quise B, Cypriani notarium,—Romæ vidisse diceret, referrique sibi solitum, nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum die præterisse; ac sibi crebro dicere, Da*

Mr. G. in his third edition, has inserted the following words as part of a note : " in order to ascertain the degree of authority which the zealous African had acquired, it may be sufficient to allege the testimony of Cyprian, the doctor and guide of all the western churches. As often as he applied himself to *his daily study of the writings of Tertullian*, he was accustomed to say, "*Da mihi magistrum*;" Give me my master."

† Page 491.

* Note 113. c. xv.

† Page 262.

Da magistrum. Tertullia- master." *Hieronym. de*
num videlicet signifi- *Viris Illustribus*, c. 53†.
 cans."

IV.

DAILLE'.

GIBBON.

" Si quis vero objiciat
 seculum ipsum, quod
 proximè ætatem aposto-
 lorum consecutum est,
 non debere ab ista suspi-
 cione immune esse, cum
Hegesippus, apud Eusebi-
um, testetur ecclesiam vir-
ginem intactam & incor-
ruptam usque ad Trajani
*tempora permansisse **,"
 &c. Euseb. Hist. Ec-
 cles. lib. iii. c. 26.

" It has been remark-
 ed, with more ingenui-
 ty than truth, that *the*
virgin purity of the church
was never violated by
schism or heresy before
the reign of Trajan, about
 one hundred years after
 the death of Christ §." *Hegesippus ap. Euseb.* l.
 iii. 32. iv. 22. ||

" Non enim comminiscendi fingendique artes
 novæ sunt; harum fraudum artifices ante quatuor-
 decim secula extiterunt †." *Hegesip. ap. Euseb.*
 l. iv. c. 22.

V.

" Extant etiam Acta Synodi Carthaginien-
 sis in qua 87 episcopi, unani-
 mi suffragio, id ipsum
 con-

Mr. G. gives us this
 note (v13. c. xv.) " Ac-
 ta Concil. Carthag. apud
 Cyprian," &c. This
 coun-

† Note 72. 3d edit. Our author, in this and some other in-
 stances, seems to have adopted a new expedient. Having found a
 remark, that he wishes to insert, with a reference to some learn-
 ed writer, he then consults a different edition, and varies the
 page, in order to disguise his plagiarism.

* Page 2.

† Page 22.

§ Page 461.

|| Note 30. c. xv.

DAILLÉ.
constituerunt." p. 187.

GIBBON.
council was composed of
eighty-seven bishops.

VI.

Observe what he says of Justin's words, that "Socrates and other pagans who lived according to reason are to be esteemed as Christians." See p. 256.

It is also Mr. G.'s remark, that "a charitable hope might perhaps be indulged in favour of Socrates, &c. who had consulted the light of reason," &c. p. 473. and note 69.

VII.

See his remarks on the wild notion of Gregory, that Ætna, and the other burning mountains in Sicily, and in that neighbourhood, are the beginnings of the conflagration, and the places of infernal torment, p. 242.

See also what our historian observes, that "the country which had been chosen for the origin and principle scene of the conflagration, was best adapted for that purpose by natural and physical causes, p. 473.

It is now plain, that several of our author's remarks, were selected from this excellent treatise. But I cannot help observing, with the learned Cave, "what regret it would have caused to the pious Daillé, had he been now alive, to see even one single argument which he had urged to overthrow the superstition of popery, and thereby purify and strengthen the Christian religion,"

I

thus

thus perverted, to undermine and sap its foundation *.

I shall close this article with a quotation from Mr. de la Croze, in which justice is done to Mr. Daillé; and a character is drawn of certain vilifiers of the Fathers, among whom I wish the candid reader may not rank our Historian.

“ Parmi ceux, qui méprisent les Pères, il peut y avoir d’habiles gens, qui le sont, ou par préjugé, ou parce qu’ils craignent qu’on ne donne trop à leur autorité.—On ne cherche ordinairement dans leurs ouvrages que l’histoire des dogmes, & celle de l’Eglise. Pendant qu’on n’ira point sur ce sujet plus loin que *Mr. Daillé*, dans son traité de *l’emploi des Peres*, on se tiendra, ce me semble, dans des bornes assez raisonnables. Mais il y a des gens qui ne sont forts, ni en raisonnement, ni en critique, qui n’ont jamais lu une page des pères, & qui ne les connoissent que par le *Medulla Sculteti*, par l’Histoire Littéraire de *Mr. Cave*, & par la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de *Mr. du Pin*. Il est dangereux de se trouver devant ces gens-là, quand ils commencent leurs invectives contre les pères : ils croiroient leur faire grace s’ils leur laissoient une once de savoir & de probité.” &c. *Entretiens sur divers sujets d’histoire*, p. 212.

* “ At si in vivis jam esset, quam ægrè ferret vir pientissimus, si aliqui reperientur, qui argumentis, quibus ipse causam pontificiam adeo feliciter debellavit, ad labefactandam & subvertendam Nicænam fidem, abuterentur.” *Epist. Apolg.* p. 18.

Instances

Instances of PLAGIARISM from BEAUSOBRE.

The extensive reading and uncommon erudition of *Beausobre* have enabled Mr. G. to display great parade of learning. And as this author openly avows a design to *apologize* for the *heretics*, which consequently induces him frequently to *handle the Fathers rather severely*; nothing could more aptly coincide with the wishes of Mr. Gibbon.

At one note, where he has quoted *Beausobre*, he seems inadvertently to furnish proofs of the charge I bring against him, that *he has transcribed Beausobre's reference to another learned publication*. The instance is as follows :

BEAUSOBRE.

"L'espere, que bien loin d'ennuyer le lecteur, je le délasserai, si avant que continuer l'histoire de *Maniché*, je lui raconte l'origine de la religion Chrétienne en Perse," &c. See also p. 183. 193.

"On peut voir, sur l'origine de *Christianisme dans la Perse*, la I. Dissertation de M. *Asséman* touchant les Nestoriens, laquelle est à la tête de la
II.

GIBBON.

"According to *Bar-desanes* (ap. *Euseb. Præpar. Evangel.*) there were *some Christians in Persia before the end of the second century*. In the time of *Constantine* (see his *Epistle to Sapor*, *Vit. l. iv. c. 13.*) they composed a flourishing church. Consult *Beausobre Hist. Critique du Manichéisme*, tom. i. p. 180. and the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*

BRAUSOBRE,

GIBBON.

II. Partie de son III. *Orientalis of Assemani*†.”
tome. Voyez aussi la I.
Partie, p. 611 *.”

I.

“ Il n'est pas aisé de
qualifier au juste le zèle
de ces anciens évêques,
qui les premiers portè-
rent les empereurs Chré-
tiens à condamner au feu
les livres des hérétiques,
&c à décerner des peines
de mort contre ceux qui
les lisoient, ou qui les
garderoient dans leurs
maisons.” p. 218.

“ The philosophers
composed against the
faith of the Gospel many
elaborate treatises, which
have since been commit-
ted to the flames by the
prudence of orthodox
emperors.” p. 566.

See Socrates Hist.
Eccl. l. i. 19 ‡. Codex
Theodosian. &c.

He then gives us this
note. “ Voyez *Socrat.* de H. E. c. i, 19. La Loi
que *Constantin* donna contre ceux qui écrivoient, ou
qui garderoient, les livres d'*Arius*, est d'une sévérité
inexcusable.” He refers to Codex Theodosian. at
c. xiii.

II.

“ Ces livres, (des Si-
bylles) tout favorables
qu'ils étoient à la reli-
gion Chrétienne, méri-
toient d'être supprimez,
parce

“ Whilst the happiness
and glory of a temporal
reign were promised to
the disciples of Christ,
the most dreadful cala-
mities

* Liv. ii, c. iii. § i, p. 180. Though the *Bibliotheca Orien-
talis* is not here specified as the work of *Assemani* which is al-
luded to, yet the frequent mention made of it by *Beausobre*,
must assure Mr. G. that it was no other.

† Note 180. c. xv.

‡ Note 142. c. xvi.

BEAUSOBRE.

parce qu' au fond ils a-
voient été supposez par
des imposteurs, & que
celui, qui portoit le
nom d'*Hystaspes* predisoit
la ruïne de l'empire."
p. 218.

"*Sublatum iri ex orbe*
"*imperium, nomenque*
"*Romanum.*" Lactant.
Instit. l. vii. 15. note 5.

GIBBON.

mities were denounced
against an unbelieving
world. A regular series
was prepared of all the
moral and physical evils
which can affect a flou-
rishing nation; all these
were only so many pre-
paratory and alarming
signs of the great cata-
strophe of Rome," &c.
p. 472.

"*Lactantius (Institut.*
Divin. vii. 15. &c.) relates the dismal tales of futuri-
ty with great spirit and eloquence." note 66. c. xv.

III.

What our author has urged, as the objections of
the Gnostics to the Mosaic law, is abstracted from
Beaufobre. I shall produce some of the parallel
passages, which it is obvious are copied. He does
indeed refer to him on this occasion*.

BEAUSOBRE.

"Nos Hérétiques—
trouvoient, que Moïse
& les Prophètes avoient
eu

GIBBON.

"*The God of Israel*
was impiously represented†
by the Gnostics, as a being
liable

* Our author thus indirectly acknowledges his obligation,
"Beaufobre, Histoire du Manichéisme, l. i. c. 3. has stated their
objections, particularly those of Faustus, the adversary of Au-
gustin, with the most learned impartiality." note 25. c. xv.

† Notwithstanding Mr. G. has added the epithet *impiously*,
it is plain from the words with which he introduces these objec-
tions of the Gnostics, that he is no more a friend to the Mosaic
dispensation

BEAUSOBRE.

eu de fausses idées des perfections divines : qu'ils avoient attribué à Dieu des passions tres-indignes de lui, la *colère*, la *vengeance*, la *jalousie*, le *repentir*." p. 286. 287.

" Ils jugeoient de même de l'ordre, que *Moïse* donne aux Israélites de *massacrer les peuples de Canaan*, sans épargner ni âge, ni sexe. Ils concluoient de là, que le Dieu de l'Hébreux n'étoit pas le vrai Dieu, ou que leurs prophètes n'étoient pas de véritables prophètes, ou enfin que leurs livres avoient été corrompus par les Juifs." p. 271.

" Nos hérétiques censuroient ensuite, avec une liberté audacieuse & profane, diverses loix Mosaïques." p. 272, 273.
 " Les promesses temporelles du V. Testament ouvroient

GIBBON.

liable to passion and to error, capricious in his favour, *implacable* in his resentment, meanly *jealous* of his superstitious worship, and confining his partial providence to a single people, and to this transitory life." p. 460.

" The conquest of the land of Canaan, and the extirpation of the unsuspecting natives, they were at a loss how to reconcile with the common notions of humanity and justice : when they recollected the *sanguinary list* of murders, of executions, and of *massacres*, which stain almost every page of the Jewish annals," &c. p. 459.

" Passing from the sectaries of the law to the law itself, they asserted that it was impossible that a religion which consisted only of bloody sacrifices and *trifling ceremonies*,

dispensation than they were. " There are some objection," says he, " against the authority of Moses and the prophets, " which too readily present themselves to the sceptical mind," &c. " These objections were eagerly embraced, and as petulantly urged by the vain science of the Gnostics." p. 459.

BEAUSOBRE.

ouvroient aux hérétiques une vaste carrière de médisances contre ce livre sacré, ou plutôt contre le Dieu des Israélites." p. 274. § 4. See also § 6. p. 277.

" Ces hérétiques n'avoient que de l'horreur pour les sacrifices, & du mépris pour toutes les cérémonies Judaïques, soutenant, qu'il étoit impossible, que le vrai Dieu eût jamais ordonné un tel culte.—Mais pour les

sacrifices sanglans, ils étoient persuadés, qu'il n'y avoit que les demons qui les exigeassent *." p. 276, 277.

" Entre ces *turpitudes* Judaïques, il n'y en avoit point qui les choquoit davantage que la circoncision." Sect. 6. p. 277.

" Ces Hérétiques s'étaient fait un système de la création du monde, de la tentation, & de la chute d'*Adam* très-différent de celui de Moïse, ils exerçoient leur critique sur les trois premiers chapitres de la Genèse,

dans

GIBBON.

monies, and whose rewards as well as punishments were all of a carnal and temporal nature, could inspire the love of virtue, or restrain the impetuosity of passion." p. 460.

" A variety of trivial though burthensome observances, were so many objects of disgust and aversion for other nations," &c. p. 454.

" The painful and even dangerous rite of circumcision was alone capable of repelling a willing proselyte from the door of the synagogue." P. 454.

" The Mosaic account of the creation and fall of man was treated with profane derision by the Gnostics, who would not listen with patience to the repose of the Deity after
fix

* See these objections answered, § 7. p. 278; 279.

BEAUSOBRE.

dans lesquels ils prétendoient trouver quantité d'absurditez. Cependant leurs objections sont évidemment frivoles." P. 280. Sect. 8.

See also p. 281.

" Les trois premiers chapitres de la Genèse, qui contiennent l'Histoire de la Creation du Monde, celle d'Adam & d'Eve, de leur tentation & de leur péché, ont toujours fait beaucoup de peine aux interprètes de l'Ecriture, soit Juifs ou Chrétiens. Un auteur moderne * qui a beaucoup d'esprit & de savoir, mais qui pense d'une manière qui paroît un peu trop libre, n'a pas dissimulé ces difficultez. Je ne parle à présent que de celles qui se présentent dans l'histoire de la tentation †."

GIBBON.

six days labour, to the rib of Adam; the garden of Eden, the trees of life and knowledge, the speaking serpent, the forbidden fruit, and the eternal condemnation pronounced against human-kind for the venial offence of the first progenitors." P. 460.

Our author makes a similar remark in a note (27. c. xv.) :

" Dr. Burnet (Archæologia, l. ii. c. 7.) has discussed the first chapters of Genesis *with too much wit and freedom.*"

Is it not surprising, that Mr. G. as an Englishman, should know nothing of Burnet's Archæologia but from the works of a foreigner ?

" Ils déclamoient contre les plus illustres patriarches, dont ils rélévoient les défauts avec la malignité la plus in-

" As those heretics were, for the most part, averse to the pleasures of sense, they morosely arraigned the polygamy of

* Thom. Burnet, Archæologia, l. ii. 7. † Livr. vii. c. 3. sect. 1.

BEAUSOBRE.

insolente." p. 273.

In a note in this passage we have the following words :

" On peut voir au long les declamations de *Fauste*.—l. 22. 5. 32. 4.

Et quos maxime Entheos credas, millenis & centenis volutari cum scortis, tanquam *David & Solomon*."

GIBBON.

of the patriarchs, the gallantries of David, and the seraglio of Solomon." p. 459.

IV.

" Que quand il seroit vrai, que *Moïse*, & les prophètes des Juifs, auroient predit le Seigneur; leur témoignage ne pouvoit servir, qu'à la conversion des Juifs qui reconnoissent leur autorité." § 9. p. 282.

" Les pères — gênez par de faux principes, ont nié quelquefois ce qu'il falloit avouer, avoué ce qu'il falloit nier : Et alors, ne pouvant se tirer des difficultez, qu'en tordant les ecritures, & en recourant à de misérables allégories, ils trahissoient, pour ainsi dire, la cause qu'ils vouloient défendre." c. iv. § 1.

" Ils éludent les objections par de frivoles allegories." p. 284.

" Their favourite argument (of prophecy) might serve to edify a Christian, or to convert a Jew, since both the one and the other acknowledge the authority of those prophecies, and both are obliged, with devout reverence, to search for their sense and their accomplishment. But this mode of persuasion loses much of its weight and influence, when it is addressed to those who neither understand nor respect the Mosaic dispensation and the prophetic style. In the unskilful hands of Justin, and of the succeeding apologists, the sublime meaning of the Hebrew oracles evaporates in distant

GIBBON.

distant types, affected conceits and cold allegories." p. 517.

BEAUSOBRE.

" St. *Augustin* cède visiblement la victoire aux Manichéens : il leur abandonne *Moïse* & le Vieux Testament lorsqu'il avouë, qu'il n'y a pas moyen de conserver le sens littéral des trois premiers chapitres de la *Genèse* sans blesser la piété, sans attribuer à Dieu des choses indignes de lui; qu'il faut absolument, pour sauver *Moïse* & son histoire, recourir à l'*Allégorie*. On passe les allégories, qui laissent subsister le sens littéral, mais on ne souffre point celles qui le détruisent, à moins qu'il ne s'agisse de paraboles, & non d'histoires." p. 285. § 4.

" Il faut pourtant excuser S. *Augustin*; il ne fait que suivre l'exemple d'*Origene*," &c. § 5.

See also § 6.

GIBBON.

" The most learned of the Fathers, by a very singular condescension, have imprudently admitted the sophistry of the Gnostics. *Acknowledging that the literal sense is repugnant to every principle of faith as well as reason*, they deem themselves secure and invulnerable behind the ample veil of *allegory*, which they carefully spread over every tender part of the Mosaic dispensation." p. 460.

See also page 565.

Mr. G. here adds this note.

" See Beausobre Hist. du Manichéisme, l. i. c. 4. *Origen* and *St. Augustin* were among the allegorists."

V.

" Ce que *Fausse* trouve étrange dans le système catholique, c'est que des Chrétiens,

" The condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous of the pagans, on

BEAUSOBRE.

Chrétiens, qui fortoient d'entre les Gentils, accordassent la vie éternelle aux pères des Hébreux, & la refusassent à leurs propres ancêtres.

“ Ce qui me choque dans
“ votre sentiment, dit
“ encore ce Manichéen,
“ ce n'est pas que notre
“ libérateur ait déployé
“ sa grace sur les pères
“ des Juifs, mais c'est
“ qu'il ne l'ait déployée
“ que sur eux, & non

“ sur les pères des Gentils, quoique la plus grande
“ partie de l'Eglise Chrétienne descende de ces der-
“ niers, & non d'Abraham, d'Isaac, & de Jacob.”
p. 291.

“ Plusieurs des peres
consideroient l'esprit, la
raison humaine, comme
une rayon, comme une
lumière, qui sort du
VERBE, ou de la raison
divine, & qui éclaire gé-
néralement tous les hom-
mes. C'est ce qui a fait
dire à “ Justin Martyr”
que “ le Christ a été con-
“ nu en partie de Socrate,
“ parce que le Christ est le
“ verbe, & que le verbe
“ est dans tous les hom-
“ mes.” Et ailleurs,
“ Nous avons dit ci de-

GIBBON.

on account of their ig-
norance or disbelief of
the divine truth seems to
offend the reason and the
humanity of the present
age. But the primitive
church, whose faith was
of a much firmer con-
sistence, delivered over,
without hesitation, to
eternal torture, the far
greater part of the hu-
man species.” p. 473.

“ A charitable hope
might perhaps be indulg-
ed in favour of Socrates,
or some other sages of
antiquity, who had con-
sulted the light of reason
before that of the Gospel
had arisen.” p. 473.

“ Justin and Clemens of
Alexandria allow, that
some of the philosophers
were instructed by the Lo-
gos; confounding its dou-
ble signification, of the hu-
man reason, and of the
divine word.” note 69.
c. v.

“ vant

BEAUSOBRE.

"vânt, que le *Christ* étant le *verbe*, tous le genté
 "humain y participe. *Car tous ceux, qui vivent*
"selon la raison, sont Chrétiens. Tels ont été parmi
 "les Grecs Socrate, Héraclite," &c. p. 307.

Justin Mart. Apolog. Clemens Alexandrin. is
 also quoted here.

VI.

BEAUSOBRE.

"Ces gens-là croy-
 oient, que le péché d'
 Adam a été l'inconti-
 nence: que l'amour
 charnel, quelque réglé
 qu'il soit, n'est point in-
 nocent: qu'il a été la
 cause de la mort, & des
 douleurs de la mort:
 Que si l'homme étoit
 demeuré vierge: si la
 partie de lumière, qui est
 en lui, n'avoit point été
 souillée de la concupis-
 cence, elle se seroit sé-
 parée de la matière sans
 difficulté.—Divers pères
 ont donné aveuglement
 dans le piège, que les
 hérétiques leur avoient
 tendu*.—Un grand
 nombre de Chrétiens, qui
 s'imaginèrent, que la
 perfection evangelique
 les appelloit à renoncer au mariage: Que des toutes

GIBBON.

"It was their favour-
 ite opinion, that if Adam
 had preserved his obedi-
 ence to the Creator, he
 would have lived for ever
 in a state of virgin puri-
 ty, and that some harm-
 less mode of vegetation
 might have peopled Pa-
 radise with a race of in-
 nocent and immortal be-
 ings." p. 484.

"Since desire was im-
 puted as a crime, and
 marriage was tolerated
 as a defect, it was con-
 sistent with the same
 principles to consider a
 state of celibacy as the
 nearest approach to the
 divine perfection." p.
 485.

* Liv. ii. c. vi. p. 414.

BEAUSOBRE.

les vertus il n'y en a point de plus sublime, de plus angélique, de plus divine, que celle de surmonter des desirs naturels *."

VII.

BEAUSOBRE.

" Ces fabuleux écrivains ont voulu persuader au monde, que tous les apôtres avoient souffert le martyre, ce qui n'est apparemment point vrai, & ce qui n'est nullement nécessaire à la religion." p. 415.

See his note on this passage, where he quotes Clemens.

GIBBON.

" If indeed we were disposed to adopt the traditions of a too credulous antiquity, we might relate the distant peregrinations, the wonderful achievements, and the various deaths of the twelve apostles." p. 531.

" In the time of Tertullian and Clemens of Alexandria, the glory of martyrdom was confined to St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. James." note 27. c. xvi.

VIII.

" Le pères s'éleverent avec véhémence contre un sentiment, qui n'étoit propre qu'à décourager les martyrs, & à les flétrir. Ils accuserent même *Basilide*, d'enseigner que c'est une folie de souffrir le martyre, & qu'il vaut mieux renoncer Jésus-Christ †." See also

" It should seem that some of these Gnostics (the Basilidians) declined, and even refused, the honour of martyrdom. Their reasons were singular and abstruse." c. xv. note 33.

c. iii. § 14. p. 41.

* C. vii. § 7. p. 424.

† Liv. iv. c. ii. p. 25, 26.

IX.

BEAUSOBRE.

" S. Irenée dit que *Basile mit au rang des choses indifférentes les plus sales débauches: & S. Epiphane, qu'il n'y a point de vices, point d'impudicités, qu'il ne permit à ses disciples. Epargnons au lecteur un plus grand nombre de citations *.*"
Iren. Epiph. Hær. 24.

" De tout tems les sectes rivales se sont mutuellement accusées de mystères profanes ou ridicules. Les payens en ont accusé les Juifs, les Juifs en accusèrent les Chrétiens, & publièrent par-tout, *que les incestes d'Oedipe, & les Festins de Thyeste, étoient leurs cérémonies sacrées. Les Chrétiens rejetèrent ces crimes sur les Gnostiques †.*"

" Il y eut beaucoup de licence dans certains mystères du paganisme.

Mais

GIBBON.

" It was sometimes faintly insinuated, and sometimes boldly asserted, that the same bloody sacrifices, and the same incestuous festivals, which were so falsely ascribed to the orthodox believers, *were in reality celebrated by the Marcionites, by the Carpocratians, and by several other sects of the Gnostics, who, notwithstanding they might deviate into the paths of heresy, were still actuated by the sentiments of men, and still governed by the precepts of Christianity ‡.* Accusations of a similar kind were retorted upon the church by the schismatics, who had departed from its communion," &c.

" But the perusal of the ancient apologies was sufficient to remove even the

* Livr. iv. c. iii. § 15.

† Mr. G. thus cites Beausobre in this place, " M. de Beausobre (Hist. du Manichéisme, l. ix. c. 8, 9.) has exposed with great spirit the dissingenuous arts of Augustin and pope Leo I." but I appeal to my reader if this is a sufficient acknowledgment of his great obligations.

‡ Liv. ix. c. viii. § 2.

BEAUSOBRE:

Mais ces infidèles, bien loin de croire en J. Christ, ne connoissoient ni lui, ni sa doctrine, ou ne les connoissoient que pour les condamner. Le Manichéen *croit en J. Christ* — Il reçoit l'évangile & l'apôtre; (S. Paul) — S'il rejette quelques endroits de ces livres sacrez, ces endroits ne concernent point la morale; — *pour les preceptes*, ils en reconnoissent la justice, la beauté, la perfection, & *sont consister l'essentiel de la religion à les suivre*. Cela est-il compatible avec des prostitutions érigés en parties du culte divin*?"

" Cette methode de défendre les Manichéens est la même dont les apologistes des Chrétiens se servoient pour se justifier des faux crimes dont les payens les accusoient. Ne citons que le seul *Athenagore*. " Afin d'avoir des prétextes de nous persécuter, on nous accuse, dit ce philosophe

GIBBON:

the slightest suspicion from the mind of a candid adversary. The Christians urge with equal truth and propriety, that the charge is not less devoid of probability, than it is destitute of evidence; they ask, whether any one can seriously believe that *the pure and holy precepts of the Gospel, which so frequently restrain the use of the most lawful enjoyments, should inculcate the practice of the most abominable crimes*; that a large society should resolve to dishonour itself in the eyes of its own members; and that a great number of persons of either sex, and every age and character, insensible to the fear of death or infamy, should consent to *violate those principles* which nature and education had imprinted most deeply in their minds. *Nothing, it should seem, could weaken the force or destroy the effect of so unanswerable*

* Liv. ix. c. viii. § 2.

BEAUSOBRE.

“ Iosophe Athénien, de
 “ faire des Festins détesta-
 “ bles, & de commettre des
 “ incestes dans nos assem-
 “ blées.” — Athenagore
 fait voir ensuite, que
 “ les principes & les
 “ Mœurs des Chrétiens
 “ suffisoient seuls pour dé-
 “ truire les calomnies qu’
 “ on répandoit contr’
 “ eux. — Que des gens qui
 “ s’abstenoient des voluptez permises parmi toutes
 “ les nations, ne se livroient pas à des voluptez
 “ que toutes les nations condamnoient. — D’où il
 “ s’ensuit qu’ils étoient innocens des crimes qu’on
 “ leur imputoit.” p. 732.

GIBBON.

answerable a justification,
unless it were the inju-
dicious conduct of the apo-
logists themselves, who
 betrayed the common
 cause of religion, to
 gratify their devout
 hatred to the domestic
 enemies of the church.”
 p. 527—529.

X.

Compare what this
 author says, on Vigils,
 and their abuse.

“ Ces dévotions noc-
 turnes ne pouvoient a-
 voir que des mauvais
 suites.—ce qui obligea
 le Concile d’Elvire en
 Espagne, de défendre
 aux femmes de s’y trou-
 ver. Il fallut les inter-
 dire entièrement dans la
 suite.” p. 666. Concil.
 Elib. Can. 35.

See also what he says
 of their abuse of the Agapæ, p. 635.

See the similar obser-
 vation and reference of
 Mr. G.

“ The 35th canon of
 the council of Illiberis
 provides against the
 scandals which too of-
 ten polluted the vigils
 of the church, and dis-
 graced the Christian
 name, in the eyes of
 unbelievers.” Note 22.
 c. xvi,

XI.

BEAUSOBRE.

“ Les Chrétiens religieux observateurs de tous les devoirs de l'humanité, & de la charité, ils n'avoient garde de négliger celui d'ensevelir les morts. C'est même à cela que Julien attribue en partie les progrès du Christianisme. “ Rien n'a plus attribué aux progrès de l'impieété Chrétienne,” dit ce prince apostat, “ que la charité des Chrétiens pour les étrangers, l'empressement qu'ils avoient de donner la sépulture aux morts, & les fausses apparences de sainteté qui éclatoient dans toute leur conduite*.” Julien. Ep. 49.

GIBBON.

“ A generous intercourse of charity united the most distant provinces, such an institution, which paid less regard to the merit than to the distress of the object, very materially conduced to the progress of Christianity. *The Pagans*, who were actuated by a sense of humanity, while they derided the doctrines, acknowledged the benevolence of the new sect.” p. 498.

“ Julian (epist. 49.) seems mortified, that the Christian charity maintains not only their own, but likewise the heathen poor.” note 141. c. xv,

XII.

Consult liv. ii. c. i. with respect to the epistle of Abgarus.

Compare this with what our author says of the legend of Abgarus, note 179. c. xv.

XIII.

* Page 639. The observation that Beausobre makes on this occasion shews a very different turn of mind from that of our author. He says, “ Ce fut effectivement à des vertus, non feintes, mais réelles, que la religion du Sauveur fut redevable en partie
de

XIII.

Compare Beausobre's Remark on the disputes between the Jew Orobio and Limborch, and his quotation of the *Amica Collatio* *, with Mr. G.'s observation on that subject, and his reference to that treatise †.

I surely need not again remind my reader, how evident it is that our author shines with learning not his own; as a planet owes its light to the effulgence of a superior luminary.

Instances of Plagiarism from DODWELL.

Of all the learned moderns, from whom Mr. G. has purloined his citations of the ancients, there is not one perhaps who has been of more general use to him than Dodwell: whose treatise *on the small number of martyrs*, has furnished our author with almost every fact he relates, and every observation he makes, in executing the design of his sixteenth chapter; “to separate a few authentic as well as
“interesting facts from an undigested mass of
“fiction and error, and to relate, in a clear and
“rational manner, the causes, the extent, the
“duration, and the most important circumstances
“of the persecutions to which the first Christians
“were exposed †.”

de ses accroissemens.”——“Ce temoignage de Julien fait beaucoup d'honneur aux Chrétiens . . . Car s'il traite la sainteté & la pureté de leurs mœurs, d'*hypocrisie*, on voit bien que c'est la haine & le préjugé, qui lui en font porter ce jugement.”

* Page 438. § 2. † Page 455. 466, note 14. c. xv.

† Page 520.

It would perhaps make no improper beginning, were I to point out the similarity which discovers itself in the *motives* which both *Dodwell* and *Gibbon* assign as *incitements to martyrdom*; but I have already observed, how proper a compliment our author pays to *Dodwell* and *Middleton* on this occasion*, which may, in some measure, atone for the great liberty he has taken in transcribing their remarks at large on this subject. I shall only add, that Mr. G. might as well have referred us to the xi. dissertation of *Dodwell*; for he has taken, to my certain knowledge, more of these reflections from that, than from the xij. and xiii. Neither needed he have been ashamed, after quoting the two dissertations by wholesale, to have added a third to the number, though it is a little extensive†.

I.

DODWELL.

“ Sed de *paucitate*
primævorum martyrum
disertissimum habemus
Origenis testimonium,
 quod miror hæcenus à
 nemine, quod sciam,
 esse animadversum. Ολι-

γοι

GIBBON.

“ The learned *Origen*, who, from his experience as well as reading, was intimately acquainted with the history of the Christians, declares, in the most express

* See p. 550, 551. and note 89. c. xvi.

† This is a practice which our author has frequently adopted, and a good artifice it is to escape detection. I have already noticed one instance in his quoting *Grotius*; without any distinction of his voluminous works. I shall here give another instance. At note 135. c. xv. he speaks of “ a rescript of *Diocletian*, “ which,” says he, “ is only a declaration of an old law.” We have no reference at all to inform us where this law is to be found. We may find it however, after turning over a few pages of the *Codex Theodosian*, lib. vi. tit. 24. l. 8. This is much the same, as if a divine should tell us of a *verse* of *St. Paul*’s without quoting the epistle and chapter.

DODWELL.

γοι (inquit) κατὰ και-
 ρος καὶ σφοδρὰ ευαριθμη-
 τοι ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν
 θεοσεβείας τεθνηκασί *.

Contr. Cels. l. iii. p.
 116.

νηκασί.

Origen advers. Celsum. l. iii. p. 116 †.

GIBBON.

express terms, that the
 number of martyrs was
 very inconsiderable †.

“ His words deserve
 to be transcribed. Ολι-

γοι κατὰ καιρὸς, καὶ σφο-
 δρὰ ευαριθμητοὶ περὶ τῶν
 Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθ-

Have I not here the reason to put the old ques-
 tion to our author, “*Tuumne obsecro? vetus credi-
 di.*” Can we hesitate a moment to determine
 the source of his information? Or can we think
 that Mr. G. would have known that there were any
words in Origen that deserved to be transcribed, un-
 less he had found them already quoted to his hands
 in Dodwell?

It is a pity, however, that our author was so
 inaccurate in transcribing this passage. If we could
 possibly imagine that one, who makes such a parade
 of Greek quotations, could be unacquainted with
 the abbreviations which are decyphered in every
 Greek grammar, this would account for his mis-
 taking the contraction $\omega\epsilon\iota$, as printed in Dod-
 well, for $\omega\epsilon$, which absolutely destroys the
 sense, and for omitting the particle τ , which is al-
 so necessary to complete it. But as Dodwell has
 inserted the article $\tau\omega\upsilon$ more than we find in Ori-
 gen, which appears also in Mr. G.’s Greek quota-
 tion, it sets the matter beyond all doubt.

* Dissertat. xi. § vii. p. 227.

† Page 546.

‡ Note 71. c. xvi.

II.

We meet with the same *general* reflections respecting the persecutions, in Mr. Dodwell and Mr. G.

That not only the most *distinguished* persons among the *Christians*, but even *women* and *slaves* were crowned with martyrdom: "*Felicitas* and *Perpetua*, and, among the martyrs of Lyons, the *slave Blandina*," are examples singled out by both *. They mention the *indifference*, nay even the *favour*, shewn by some of the *emperors* towards the *Christians* †. They have the same quotation from *Tertullian* to shew that *Trajan* frustrated in some degree the laws enacted against the *Christians*, "*quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est*, Apolog. c. 5. ‡" They both inform us, that *Trajan* restrained "*the popular clamours*, which condemned the *Christians* to the lions;" that he forbade the magistrates to make search after the *Christians*; that, by the edicts of *Hadrian* and *Antoninus Pius*, those informers, who falsely accused men as being *Christians*, suffered in their stead; And reference is made by each to "*the Apology of Melito apud Euseb. l. iv. c. 26.* and to *Justin Apolog. ii. §*"—Hence they both draw a general inference, that many of the persecutions which arose in the provinces were owing to the disposition of the governors: In describing these persecutions, the same kinds of punishment are specified by each of these writers ||.

* Compare Dodwell Dissertat. xi. sect. v. with Gibbon, p. 546, and note 70. c. xvi.

† See Dodwell, sect. viii. x, Gibbon, p. 555. 541, 542.

‡ Dodwell, sect. viii. Gibbon, note 58. c. xvi.

§ Consult Dodwell, sect. ix, x. See also sect. xi. p. 267. See Gibbon, p. 541—543. Notes 59, 61. c. xvi.

|| Dodwell, sect. 8. 38. Gibbon, p. 543. 545.

After

After these general reflections, Mr. Dodwell descends to a particular examination of the several persecutions and martyrdoms which happened under the reigns of the emperors, as they succeeded respectively to the throne. Sect. 13. "Age itaque breviter percurramus has, quas ita *sanguinarias* existimant *persecutiones*." The following instances will shew, that in this part of his history at least, Mr. G. chiefly consulted the original materials, which the learning of Mr. Dodwell had stored up.

III.

We find in Dodwell's account of Nero's persecution, on the authority of Tacitus, the great number of the Christians expressed by the words "ingens multitudo." The religion styled "exitiabilis superstitio,"—the effects of the persecution confined to the walls of Rome*. These are circumstances which particularly distinguish Mr. G.'s description†.

IV.

Mr. D. says of the persecution of Domitian, "The persecution of Domitian (if it deserves that epithet) was of no long duration §," &c. potuent ‡."

Compare what Mr. G. says of the execution of *Clemens* the Consul, by Domitian, and the banishment of *Domitilla*, for *Atheism* and *Jewish manners*, together with a great number of other persons||; and his reference to Eusebius iii. 18. and to

* Sect. 13. † P. 509. 532, &c. note 34. 165. c. xvi.

‡ Sect. 16. p. 236.

§ Page 539.

|| Page 539.

Dion,—

Dion *,—with Mr. Dodwell's words, and quotation of Eusebius, iii. 18. †

V.

Mr. G. has introduced the above account with a story about the grandsons of St. Jude, which he tells us, is taken from *Hegefippus*. But the reader will be inclined to think he took it from Dodwell.

DODWELL.

“Consentit cum *Terulliano*, de hac *Domitiani*, mutatione, *Hegefippus*. Cum enim in *Davidicam* familiam ille inquisivisset, & pro locupletibus metuendisque pauperes illos spernendosque reperisset; illum hujus inquisitionis eventum ita describit *Hegefippus*, *Domitianum* ελευθερος μεν αυτης ανειναι, καταπαυσαι δε δια της προσταγματος του κατα της εκκλησιας διωγμον. Euseb. iii. 20.

GIBBON.

“Among the Christians, who were brought before the tribunal of the emperor,—were the grandsons of St. Jude the apostle.—Their natural pretensions to the throne of David, might perhaps attract the respect of the people, and excite the jealousy of the governor; but the meanness of their garb, and the simplicity of their answers, soon convinced him that they were neither desirous nor capable of disturbing the peace

of the Roman empire.—The grandsons of St. Jude were dismissed with compassion and contempt †.” “Euseb. iii. 20. The story is taken from *Hegefippus* §.”

* Note 52. c. xvi.

† Dodwell, sect. 16.

‡ Page 538.

§ Note 49. c. xvi.

VI.

DODWELL.

“ Jam si *Lactantium* audimus, à *Domitiano* ad *Decium* usque nulla erat omnino persecutio. Ita enim ille: “ *Rescissis igitur actis tyranni* ||, non modo in statum pristinum ecclesia restituta est, sed etiam multo clarius ac floridius enituit.—Sed enim postea longa pax rupta est. *Exstitit enim, post annos plurimos, execrabile animal Decius, qui vexaret ecclesiam* *.” *Lactant.* de mort. persecut. c. 3, 4.

GIBBON.

“ The condition (of the Christians) ever since the time of Domitian, was represented as a state of perfect freedom and security, if compared with the rigorous treatment which they experienced under the short reign of Decius †.”

“ *Lactantius, de Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 3, 4.* After celebrating the felicity and increase of the church, under a long succession of good princes; he adds, “ *Exstitit post annos plurimos, execrabile animal, Decius, qui vexaret ecclesiam* ‡.”

VII.

In sect. 25, 26. Mr. D. makes several observations which correspond with those of our author, “ on the conduct and character of Pliny, and on the praise bestowed on him by Tertullian for his fair and honourable testimony §.”

|| This particular expression is closely translated by Mr. G. p. 540. He says, “ The memory of Domitian was condemned by the senate, his acts were rescinded,” &c.

* Sect. 17. page 238.

† Page 560.

‡ Note 120. c. xvi.

§ P. 507. 540. notes 15. 23. c. xvi.

VIII.

VIII.

We come now to the state of the Christians, in the reign of *Commodus*, which our authors thus describe.

DODWELL.

"Sub *Commodo* pacem ecclesiæ fuisse *diapovov* testis est illorum temporum scriptor *Asterius Urbani* *, quam pacem cunctas orbis ecclesias complexam esse scribit *Eusebius* †. Nempe *Mariam Christianorum* fuisse patronam ait, *Dione* suo fortasse auctore, *Xiphilinus* ‡. *Xiphilin.* in *Commodo*.

GIBBON.

"*The Christians were protected by the lenity of Commodus.* The celebrated *Marcia* entertained a singular affection for the oppressed church, and declared herself *the patroness of the Christians* §."

In a note our author refers to "*Dion Cassius, or rather, his abbreviator Xiphilin. l. lxxii. p. 1206.*" ||

IX.

The next persecution was that of *Severus*, of which we have this account.

"*Quintam deinde persecutionem Severo tribuit Eusebius, &c.*—Nec tamen illam ipsam inchoatam putant ante X. ejus annum.—Tempus enim notavit

"Nor was the peace of the church interrupted, till the increasing numbers of proselytes seem at length to have attracted the attention, and

* Ap. Euseb. Hist. v. 16.

† Sect. 40.

|| Note 106. c. xvi.

† Euseb. Hist. Eccles. v. 29.

§ Page 557.

DODWELL.

notavit accuratissime in *Severi vita Spartianus*.—

“In itinere Palæstinis
“plurima jura fundavit.
“*Judæos fieri sub gravi*
“*pæna vetuit. Idem etiam*
“*de Christianis sanxit* *.”

“Est etiam id observatione dignum, *Christianos* fieri duntaxat vetuisse *Severum*, nihil autem esse quo jam *factos* posset colligi ejus esse jussu puniendos †.

“*Populi* itaque potius quam *Severi* furore nata hæc videtur persecutio, & quanquam cessit populo in emittendo persecutionis decreto, *restitit* tamen eidem in os *Christianos* amicos ad supplicium poscenti.—“*Populo* *furenti* in os *palam restitit*,” ut ait Tertulianus ad Scap. c. 4.

GIBBON.

and to have alienated the mind, of Severus. With the design of restraining the progress of Christianity, he published an edict, which, *though it was designed to affect only the new converts*, could not be carried into strict execution, without exposing to danger and punishment the most zealous of their teachers and missionaries ‡.

“*Judæos fieri sub gravi pæna vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit*.” Hist. Augult. p. 70. §

“Under the reign of Severus, *the fury of the populace was checked*; the rigour of antient laws was for some time suspended,” &c ‖.

Compare Mr. D.'s remark at this place, that the Christians often suffered with the Jews, as the heathens made little distinction between them **,—and Mr. G.'s observations, p. 530. 537, 538. Each of them notice the same passage of *Suetonius* ††.

* Spartian. Sever. c. 16, 17. sect. 40.

† Sect. 46.

† Page 558.

§ Note 110. c. xvi.

‖ P. 557.

** Sect. 42.

†† Dodwell, sect. 42. and Gibbon,

note 25. xvi.

Mr. G. gives us no account of the *persecution* of *Severus*, which Dodwell ingenuously acknowledges*.

X.

With regard to *Caracalla* we read as follows.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

"Jam *Caracalla* tempora ut aliis fuerint *cruentissima*, at *Christianis* certe prorsus *avariata* fuisse *versimillimum* est. "*Laete Christiano educationum*," ait *Tertullianus*." ad Scap. c. 4.

See what he observes of the peaceable, nay friendly disposition of the successors of *Severus*, towards the Christians †.

"The nurse as well as the preceptor of *Caracalla* were *Christians*; and if that young prince ever betrayed a sentiment of humanity, it was occasioned by an accident, which, however trifling, bore some relation to the cause of Christianity ‡."

Compare the life of *Caracalla* in the *Augustan* history, with the epistle of *Tertullian* to *Scapula* §."

XI.

We come next to *Alexander Severus*.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

"Ab illa *Severi* xxxviii. annorum intervallum interponit *Sulpicius*. Recte nimirum ille, pro communi sententia, modo decadem, quæ intercidit reponas," &c. ||

"Nec sane aliter tam longa

"But the laws which *Severus* had enacted, soon expired with the authority of that emperor; and the *Christians*, after this accidental tempest, enjoyed a calm of thirty-eight years**."

"Sul-

* Sect. 43, 44.

§ Note 107. c. xvi.

† Sect. 47.

|| Sect. 52.

‡ Page 557.

** Page 558.

DODWELL.

longa illa fuisset pax de qua meminit in libro de lapsis, Cyprianus, &c*.

“Quam vero *amicum Christianis* fuerit *Alexandri* imperium, abunde manifestum est. *Christianis* ille publicum locum occupantibus in *ecclesiæ* usum concessit. Idem *Christianos* in munerum publicorum dispositione sibi in exemplum proposuit. Idem *Christum* in *larario* majore sanctioreque habuit, quod nullos tamen nisi divos optimosque & consecratos complecteretur. Idem *Christo templum* facere voluit, eumque inter *Deos* recipere †.”

E scriptore suorum temporum. Hist. August. c. 29. 31. c. 43. 51. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 21.

“Sed & *Mammæa* mater (cui nimium in reipub. administratione permissum esse queruntur,)—ipsa quoque *Christiana* fuit, & *Origenem* accer-

GIBBON.

“Sulpicius Severus, l. ii. p. 384.”

“This computation (allowing for a single exception) is confirmed by the history of *Eusebius*, and by the writings of *Cyprian* †.”

“They were now permitted to erect and consecrate convenient edifices for the purpose of religious worship; to purchase lands, even at Rome itself, for the use of the community; and to conduct the election of their ecclesiastical ministers in so public, but at the same time in so exemplary a manner, as to deserve the respectful attention of the Gentiles §. The emperor Alexander adopted their method of publicly proposing the names of those persons who were candidates for ordination,” &c.

See the Augustan history, p. 130. ||

Afterwards we read, “The sentiments of *Mammæa*

* Sect. 48. See also sect. ix. p. 229.

† Sect. 47.

‡ Note 111. c. xvi.

§ Page 558.

|| Note 112. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

accesavit ut ab eo in doctrina Christi erudiretur. Ea cum ita se haberent, non erat quod Christiani metuerent, sive a plebium tumultibus, sive etiam à præfectis provinciarum," &c.

GIBBON.

Mammæa were adopted by her son Alexander. In his domestic chapel he placed the statues of Abraham, of Orpheus, of Apollonius, and of *Christ* *."

See the Augustan history, p. 123 †.

"When the empress Mammæa passed through Antioch, she expressed a desire of conversing with the celebrated Origen, the fame of whose piety and learning was spread over the east. Origen obeyed so flattering an invitation," &c. ‡ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 21. Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. c. 54. §

XII.

The conduct of the emperor *Maximin* is thus represented by our two authors.

DODWELL.

"In odium *Philipporum* persecutus est *Decius*, in odium *Alexandri Maximinus* ¶."

"Successit deinde *Alexandro Maximinus*.—Hanc in ecclesiarum sacerdotes factam a *Maximino*, ait *Eusebius*.—*Orosius* persecutionem hanc in

GIBBON.

"After the death of Alexander, when the inhuman Maximin discharged his fury on the favourites and servants of his unfortunate benefactor, a great number of Christians, of every rank and of both sexes, were involved in the promiscuous

* Page 559

† Mr. G. always refers to the page, not to the chapter, of the Augustan history; another way of disguising favours received. It is a pity he did not alter the reference to *Eusebius*, and not suffer it to stand the same in his quotation, as in Dodwell's.

‡ Page 559.

§ Note 114. c. xvi.

¶ Sect. 10.

DODWELL.

in *Sacerdotes & Clericos*, i. e. *doctores*, motam esse tradit.—Præcipue propter *Origenem* presbyterum persecutionem hanc a *Maximino* esse concitatum,” &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 28.

“Ita non ad multos pertinebat illa persecutio.—Cui etiam consentit *Firmilianus*, quod *persecutio illa non per totum mundum, sed localis fuisset*, si tamen de eadem persecutione sit intelligendus *.” Sulp. Sever. Sacr. Hist. l. 2. *Firmilianus* Ep. apud Cyprian. 75.

“Necesse erat hanc *persecutionem* omnino fuisse *brevissimam* †.”

GIBBON.

uous massacre, which, on their account, has improperly received the name of persecution.” Eusebius, l. vi. c. 28 †.

“Notwithstanding the cruel disposition of Maximin, the effects of his resentment against the Christians were of a *very local and temporary nature*, and the pious *Origen*, who had been proscribed as a devoted victim, was still reserved to convey the truths of the Gospel to the ear of monarchs §.”

“Orosius, l. vii. c. 19. mentions Origen as the object of Maximin’s resentment; and *Firmilianus* a Cappadocian bishop of that age, gives a just and confined idea of this persecution (apud Cyprian. epist. 75.) ¶”

* Sect. 48. As I have before censured Mr. G.’s quotation of Firmilianus, it is proper to observe that my charge does not affect Mr. Dodwell, as he speaks of this persecution, not with that confined idea in which our author represents it, as relating *only* to bishops and priests; but as extending itself to the Christians *in general* (sect. 51.) However closely Mr. G. copies the dissertation, he seldom is so liberal as to specify facts that make against his hypothesis. † Sect. 49. ‡ Note 116. c. xvi.

§ Page 559.

¶ Note 117. c. xvi.

XIII.

The severe persecution of *Decius* is the next in order.

DODWELL.

Iniquissimi quidem illi, ut longe alium nobis *Decium* repræsentent quam suoapte fuerit ingenio.—Plane innuunt, præterquam in *Christianos*, non tam fuisse, quam putatur, *sanguinolentum Decii* imperium.—Demus aliquid superstitio-
ni. At cum ita crederet pro bono reipublicæ in Christianos esse sæviendum," &c*.—"*Primum legimus martyrem Fabianum sub finem Januarii. Sub discessum fortasse Decii, nec enim diu ille Romæ est moratus. Postea paulo plusquam annum intercessit intervallum antequam in Fabiani locum sufficeretur Cornelius. Inde colligimus ea usum esse arte in ecclesiæ persecutione*

GIBBON.

"The virtues of that prince (*Decius*) will scarcely allow us to suspect that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor †, and it is more reasonable to believe, that in the prosecution of his general design to restore the purity of Roman manners, he was desirous of delivering the empire from what he condemned as a recent and criminal superstition.

"The *bishops* of the most considerable cities were removed by exile or death; the vigilance of the magistrates prevented the clergy of Rome, during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election," &c ‡.

Our

* Sect. 52.

† We have already seen that *Eusebius*, as here cited, has imputed this persecution "to the *resentment* by which *Decius* was actuated against the favourites of his predecessor:" We have seen that Dodwell also says, "*in odium Philipporum persecutus est Decius*," sect. 10. Yet our author contradicts their authority, without appealing to any other testimony to prove his assertion.

‡ Page 560.

DODWELL.

secutione *Decium* qua
usus antea fuerat *Maxi-*
minus ut in ecclesiæ *sa-*
cerdotes præcipue perfe-
cutionem intentaret,"
&c.—"Et vero totum
opprimendæ *Christiani-*
tatis præsidium in eo esse
positum à *Decio*, si *sedem*
Romæ vacuam servasset,
ex illis nostri martyris
(*Cypriani*) verbis colligimus
quæ scripsit ad *Antonianum*. "*Multo*
"(inquit) *patientius* &
"*tolerabilius* audisse *De-*
"*cium* levare adversus se
"*æmulum principem* quam
"*constitui Romæ æmulum*
"*sacerdotem*." Quorsum
illud, ni gravius aliquod
momentum in ea situm
credidisset Romanæ sedis
vacatione?"

Cyprian. epist. 52 *.

* *Seft. 53.*

† As Mr. Dodwell observes with regard to the date, "si ta-
men recte tempus consignatum à vitarum pontificalium concin-
natoribus;" it was an easy matter from any martyrology or
chronological table to point out a particular day.

‡ *Note 121. c. xvi.*

§ This citation of Eusebius occurs at section 55. where Dod-
well is speaking of the effects of this persecution in Palestine.

|| *Page 560.*

** *Note 121. c. xvi.*

GIBBON.

Our author here makes
the following note :

"*The see of Rome re-*
maind vacant from the
martyrdom of Fabianus, to
the 20th of January,
A. D. 250 †, till the
election of Cornelius, the
4th of June, A. D. 251.
Decius had probably left
Rome, since he was kill-
ed before the end of that
year ‡."

Euseb. l. vi. c. 39 §.

"It was the opinion
of the Christians, that
the emperor would more
patiently endure a compe-
titor for the purple, than
a bishop in the capital ¶."

Cyprian. epist. 55 **.

Had our author fairly copied from Dodwell, he might have informed us, from sect. 54—57. of the *extent and rigour* of this persecution.

XIV.

The administration of *Valerian* is next treated of.

DODWELL.

“Quem (Valerianum) tamen *primis* imperii annis *Christianis amicissimum* fuisse testetur coævus *Dionysius*. Tam fuisse *Christianis* amicum ait quam fuerint οἱ λεχθέντες ἀναφραδὸν χριστιανοὶ γεγρονεῖναι. (*Alexandrum*, ni fallor, intelligit atque *Philippos*) quin & illos *benevolentia superasse*; familiam præterea totam *Christianis* abundasse, ut ecclesia *Dei* esse videretur *. Accedebat fortasse & alia ratio.—Quod nempe *magicis operationibus Christiani adversissimi haberentur*.—Ideo *Valerianum Macrianus Magus* ad persecutionem adegit.”

Dionys. Alexand. ap. Hist. Eccles. vii. 10.

GIBBON.

“The administration of *Valerian* was distinguished by a levity and inconstancy, ill suited to the gravity of the Roman censor. *In the first part of his reign, he surpassed in clemency those princes who had been suspected of an attachment to the Christian faith*. In the last three years and a half, listening to the insinuations of a minister addicted to the superstitions of Egypt, he adopted the maxims, and imitated the example of his predecessor *Decius* †.” Euseb. l. vii. c. 10 ‡.

“The mention of *those princes who were publicly supposed to be Christians*, as we find it in an epistle of *Dionysius of Alexandria* (ap. Euseb.

* Sect. 62. p. 296.
particular account of this persecution given us by Mr. G. but we find it in Dodwell, sect. 59—63.

† P. 560, 561. We have no
‡ Note 122. c. xvi,

GIBBON.

feb. l. vii. c. 10.) evidently alludes to Philip, and his family *."

XV.

Of *Gallienus*, the next emperor, we have this account.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

"Capto *Valeriano* revocavit ejus edicta *Gallienus*, restitutis ubique locis sacris. Extat hodieque ejus rescriptum apud *Eusebium* †." *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 13.*

"The accession of *Gallienus* restored peace to the church; and the Christians obtained the free exercise of their religion by an edict addressed to the bishops, and conceived in such terms as seemed to acknowledge their office and public character †."—" *Eusebius* (l. vii. c. 13.) gives us a Greek version of this Latin edict, which seems to have been very concise §."

XVI.

The conduct of *Aurelian* is now to be considered.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

"Inde nemo est de persecutione suspectus usque ad *Aurelianum*.—Intentata duntaxat erat ab *Aureliano*, non item executioni mandata. Id satis manifeste indicant scriptores

"The ancient laws, without being formally repealed, were suffered to sink into oblivion,—some *hostile intentions* are attributed to the emperor *Aurelian* ||.

"*Euseb.*

* Note 118. c. xvi.

† Sect. 63.

‡ Page 561.

§ Note 123. c. xv.

|| P. 561.

DODWELL.

scriptores illis temporibus proximi, Lactantius & Eusebius.—Similiter Eusebius de eodem Aureliano*.” Lactant. de Mort. Perf. c. 6. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 30.

“*Impulsus* erat duntaxat *Aurelianus* ut persecutionem adversus Christianos commoveret, & de ea rumor solum, quasi de re nondum ad exitum perducta ferebatur †.”—“Sed Eusebio

opposuit (Baronius) quæ scripserat in *Chronico* idem *Eusebius*,” &c. In Chron. Græc. Euseb. ‡.

“Nescio tamen an integrioribus *Hieronimi* codicibus usus fuerit *Orosius*, propius certe accessit ad mentem *Eusebii*,” &c §. Oros. l. vii. c. 23.

GIBBON.

“Euseb. l. vii. c. 30. Lactantius de M. P. c. 6. Hieronym. in Chron. p. 177. Orosius, l. vii. c. 23.”

“Their language is in general so ambiguous and incorrect, that we are at a loss to determine how far Aurelian had carried his intentions before he was assassinated ¶.”

* Sect. 64.

† Sect. 64.

‡ P. 300. I have already noted Mr. G's error in quoting the *Chronicon* of *Jerome* instead of *Eusebius*. He was probably led into it by mistaking this passage which I have extracted, though for a cloak he refers to a different edition. Mr. Dodwell is indeed appealed to in these words,

“Most of the moderns (except Dodwell, Dissertat. Cyprian. xi. 64.) have seized the occasion of gaining a few extraordinary martyrs.”

But surely my reader will agree with me, that this is by no means a sufficient acknowledgment for his having transcribed every one of his references.

§ Page 301.

¶ Note 124. c. xvi.

XVII.

The persecution of *Diocletian* is thus introduced.

DODWELL.

“ Ab *Aureliano* deinde ad *Diocletianum* neminem habent imperatorum de persecutione suspectum.— Sed verò hæc ut omnium longissima erat, ita etiam forte sævissima, certe martyrum proven- tu erat copiosissima. Inde factum ut *Æram Diocletiani* recentiores Græci *Æram martyrum* appel- lent *.”

“ Quod itaque per to- tum *hujus* imperium per- secutionem fuisse putent, longe abest ut verum fu- erit. “ *Multa erant* è contra prolixissimæ im- peratorum in Christianos benevolentiae indicia. Re- gendas Christianis pro- vincias crediderunt, om- ni sacrificandi metu, qui præfectis provinciarum ex officio imminebat, il- los liberabant. Quin & in ipsis imperatorum pala- tiis, liberi versati sunt. Ipse eorum uxores & li- beri

GIBBON.

“ Amidst the frequent revolutions of the em- pire, the Christians still flourished in peace and prosperity.—A celebra- ted æra of martyrs has been deduced from the suc- cession of *Diocletian* †.”

“ The principal eu- nuchs,—who attended the person, possessed the favour, and governed the household of *Diocletian*, protected by their power- ful influence the faith which they had em- braced. Their example was imitated by many of the most considerable offi- cers of the palace,—and though it might some- times be incumbent on them to accompany the emperor, when he sacri- ficed in the temple, they enjoyed, with their wives, their children, and their slaves, the free exercise of the Christian religion. *Diocletian* and his col- leagues

DODWELL.

beri & servi erant Christiani."

"His ea quæ religionis suæ erant, tam verbis quam factis libere exequendi coram semet ipsis potestatem dederunt; ipsis ob hanc fidei suæ libertatem gloriari ac se ostentare quodammodo permittentes; eoque præ cæteris omnibus ministris præcipuo quodam amore complectebantur. Id genus exempla aliqua profert Eusebius. Quin & singulis ecclesiarum antistitibus summus honor, cultus ac benevolentia ab omnibus tam privatis quam provinciarum rectoribus delatus est. Innumerabilem præterea hominum quotidie ad fidem Christi confugientium fuisse turbam, immensum ecclesiarum in singulis urbibus numerum, illustres populorum in sacris ædibus concursus, quo factum esset ut *priscis ædificiis jam non contenti in singulis urbibus spatiosas ab ipsis fundamentis*

GIBBON.

leagues frequently conferred the most important offices on them.—The bishops held an honourable rank in their respective provinces, and were treated with distinction and respect, not only by the people but by the magistrates themselves. Almost in every city, the ancient churches were found insufficient to contain the increasing number of proselytes; and in their place more stately and capacious edifices were erected for the public worship of the faithful."

"The leisure of the two empresses, of his wife Prisca, and of Valeria his daughter, permitted them to listen with more attention and respect to the truths of Christianity *."

Lactantius de M. P. c. 15†.

* P. 564.

† Note 131. c. xvi.

extruerent ecclesias, tradit Eusebius," &c*. Hist. Eccles. viii. 1.

DODWELL.

"Tales (Christianos) fuisse constat *Diocletiani uxorem Priscam, & filiam ejusdem Valeriani, Maximiani autem Galerii uxorem* †." Lactant de Mort. Perf. 15.

Mr. Dodwell then relates the *cause* which Lactantius (de Mort. Perf. n. 10.) gives for *Diocletian's persecution*; "because the Christians interrupted his "religious rites and enquiries into futurity ‡." But this chapter Mr. G. has unhappily referred to as a proof of the favour of Diocletian to the Christians §.

We thus read of the effects of the persecution :

DODWELL.

"Primum persecutionis gradum in *Milites* fuisse tradit *Eusebius*."

Hist. Eccles. viii. 1**.

"Emissa itaque sunt adversus *milites* persecutionis edicta, nondum tamen *sanguinaria*.—*Pas-* sos tamen aliquos, licet non pro imperatoris edic-

to,

GIBBON.

"Maximian and Galerius,—in the general administration of the provinces, obeyed the laws which their benefactor had established; but *they frequently found occasions of exercising* within their camps and palaces *a secret persecution,*" &c ‖. Euseb. l. viii. c. 4—17.

"He.

* Sect. 66. Our author has cited Lactantius only, as if *all this* passage was taken from *him*; whereas we see it is taken from Eusebius, l. viii. c. 1. but he is not quoted till Mr. G. speaks of "the corruption of manners and principles," note 134. Then we read, Eusebius, l. viii. c. 1. &c.

† Sect. 66.

‡ Sect. 68, 69. See also sect. 30.

§ Note 133. c. xvi.

** Sect. 68.

‖ Page 566.

DODWELL.

to, at *pro ministri propria* sævitia, docet *Eusebius*, sed ita docet, ut innuat omnino fuisse paucissimos." Euseb. Hist. Eccl. viii. 4.

"Ego neutra interpretatione *Eusebii* mentem existimo affecturum esse *Valesium*.—Huic itaque persecutionis illius quæ in milites exercenda erat, curam commisit imperator. Ita recte verterit *Hieronymus*. Hos verberibus animadverti iusserat *Diocletianus*. Ex his verberibus nonnullos mortuos fuisse crediderim, quos tamen cum *ἐνα πρ καὶ δευτερον* et *ἐνις*, dicat *Eusebius*, id palam innuit fuisse paucissimos ||."

"Dimissus à *Diocletiano* *Galerius*—primo vere movit in *Persas*, quos uno prælio penitus debellavit.—Ita ut reversus à *Diocletiano*—cum ingenti honore susceptus fuerit. Rediit—in *Bythyniam*

GIBBON.

"He limits the number of military martyrs by a remarkable expression (*σταυρῶς τούτων εἰς πρ καὶ δευτερος*), of which neither his Latin nor French translator have rendered the energy *."

"After the success of the Persian war had raised the hopes and reputation of *Galerius*, he passed a winter with *Diocletian* in the palace of *Nicomedia*; and the fate of Christianity became the object of all their secret consultations. The experienced emperor was still inclined to pursue measures of lenity; and urged, on the strongest terms, the danger as well as cruelty of shedding the blood of those deluded fanatics †."

"The oracle of *Apollo* at *Miletus* was consulted by *Diocletian*, before he published his edicts of persecution. *Lactantius* de M. P. c. 11 ‡."

"*Galerius*

|| Sect. 69.

* Note 143. c. xvi. How new this remark of Mr. G. is we may surely conjecture, as *Dodwell* censures *Valesius* his French, and *Jerome* his Latin translator, and gives him the words of *Eusebius*.

† Page 567.

‡ Note 136. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

thyniam hyematum *Diocletianus*.—*Illum secutus est postea Galerius, ut totam illam hyemem consultationibus de persecutione insumferint. Repugnabat diu Diocletianus—cum Galerium desistere non posset; consulti deinde amici, tum etiam Dii, & præ aliis Apollo Milesius*.*.—“*Hanc tamen moderationem tenere conatus est ut eam rem sine sanguine transigi juberet, cum Cæsar vivos cremari vellet qui sacrificio repugnassent* †.” *Lactant. n. 10, 11.*

“*Successit fatalis annus Diocletiani in quo omnes fere consentiunt initium decennalis persecutionis esse collocandum. Vere ineunte, jam conveniebat de persecutione, inquirebatur duntaxat (ominis causa) peragendæ rei dies aptus & felix,*” tandemque “*terminalia*” delecta sunt,

GIBBON.

Galerius at length extorted from him the permission of summoning a council,—and those ambitious courtiers easily discerned, that it was incumbent on them to second, by their eloquence, the importunate violence of the Cæsar,—Who proposed, that *every one refusing to offer sacrifice should immediately be burnt alive* ‡.

“Arguments, like these, may seem to have determined the reluctant mind of Diocletian to embrace a new system of persecution §.”

“The pleasure of the emperor was at length signified to the Christians.—*The twenty-third of February, which coincided with the Roman festival of the Terminalia, was appointed (whether from accident, or design) to set bounds to the progress of Christianity. At the earliest dawn of day, the*

* See also sect. 67.

† Sect. 70.

‡ P. 567. 569. Our author has not inserted this passage as it stands connected in Dodwell, but postponed it for a page or two.
§ Page 568.

DODWELL.

sunt, "ut quasi terminus imponeretur Christianæ religionis." Is erat vii. Kal. Mart. Feb. xxiii. Eo itaque die ecclesiam diruebant, scripturas incendebant *Nicomediae*, quod reliquo deinde imperio foret in exemplum. Proximo die Feb. xxiv. edictum *Nicomediae* propositum est, quo, "cavebatur ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subjecti essent ex quocunque ordine aut gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio caleret, ipsi non de injuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatis agere possent, libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent *." Lac-
tantius, de M. P. n.

12, 13.

"Erat & aliud ex Eusebii Testimonio edictum μετ' ου πολυ non multo post superius emissum, quo mandatum est προειδους omnes ubicumque

GIBBON.

the doors of the church of *Nicomedia* were broke open; and they committed to the flames the volumes of holy scripture †."

"The next day the general edict of persecution was published; persons of a liberal birth were declared incapable of holding any honours or employments. The judges were authorized to hear and to determine every action that was brought against a Christian. But the Christians were not permitted to complain of any injury which they themselves had suffered.—It was enacted, that their churches, in all the provinces of the empire, should be demolished to their foundations ‡."

The governors of the provinces were directed to apprehend all persons of the ecclesiastical order; and the prisons destined for the vilest criminals, were soon

* Sect. 71.

† Page 568.

‡ P. 569, 570.

DODWELL.

que Ecclesiarum, primum quidem ut conjicerentur in vincula, deinde vero ut Diis sacrificare omnibus modis cogerentur. Προεδρων omnes cujuscunque ordinis clericos intellexisse Imperatores, è decreti executione manifestum est. — Pro primo hujus edicti gradu ita carceres fuisse repletos Episcopis, presbyteris, diaconis, lectoribus, atque exorcistis, ut nullus iis qui ob alia crimina condemnati essent, jam locus superesset *, &c. Euseb. viii. 7.

Cruciatibus potiusquam cæde sævitum sit, ut qui martyrium passi sunt, eorum plerique ipso cruciatuum dolore extincti fuerint, &c †. Euseb. de Mart. Palæst. c. 2.

Successerunt deinde, si Eusebio credimus, edicta sæviora quibus παν-

τας πανδημει τις κατα πολιν θυειν τε και σπενδειν τοις ειδωλοις εκελευετο. De Mart. Pal. c. 3. §.

GIBBON.

soon filled with a multitude of bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers, and exorcists. By a second edict, the magistrates were commanded to employ every method of severity, which might reclaim them from their odious superstition, and oblige them to return to the established worship of the gods. This rigorous order was extended, by a subsequent edict, to the whole body of Christians, who were exposed to a violent and general persecution †.

At first, indeed, the magistrates were restrained from the effusion of blood; but the use of every other severity was permitted and even recommended to their zeal, &c ‖.

* Sect. 72.

† Page 311.

§ Sect. 74.

† Page 574.

‖ Page 572.

DODWELL.

Multos equidem periculo involvebant hujusmodi edicta, cum quicumque synaxibus interfuissent de vita illis esset periclitandum*.

Inde etiam est quod secundo persecutionis anno *purpuram deposuisse Diocletianum* atque *Maximianum* constat à *Lactantio* †. de M. P. n. 19.

secution, he divested himself of the Imperial purple ‖.

GIBBON.

The punishment of death was denounced against all who should presume to hold any secret assemblies for the purpose of religious worship †.

Diocletian had no sooner published his edicts against the Christians, than, as if he had been desirous of committing to other hands the right of per-

XVIII.

After the *resignation of Diocletian*, our author, according to the plan of *Dodwell*, “separately considers the state of Christianity in the different parts of the empire.”

DODWELL.

“Eodem spectat quod, tertio tandem persecutionis anno, persecutionem dicat a Maximino fuisse resuscitatam §.”

“Videamus itaque jam qualis fuerit in reliquis

GIBBON.

“Maximin gratified his own inclination, by yielding a rigorous obedience to the stern commands of his benefactor**.”

“When Galerius had gained

* Page 319.

‖ Page 575.

† Sect. 73.

§ Page 314.

† Page 569.

** Page 579.

DODWELL.

liquis eadem illa persecutio. In *Galerii* imperio omnino probabile est, pro sævissimi principis ingenio, fuisse etiam sævissimam."

GIBBON.

gained the supreme power and the government of the east, he indulged in their fullest extent his zeal and cruelty *."

XIX.

Of *Constantius* we find this account.

DODWELL.

"*Constantium* ab initio amicissimum του κατ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀελαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους φυλάξαντα· καὶ μὴτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τὰς οἰκὰς καθελόντα μεθ' ἑτέρων τι κατ' ἡμῶν καὶ νερῶν γησαντα tradit *Eusebius* l. viii.

Discrepit nonnihil *Lactantius* †, cujus hæc sunt verba: "Constantius, ne dissentire a
"majorum

GIBBON.

"The mild and humane temper of *Constantius* was averse to the oppression of any part of his subjects. The principal offices of his palace were exercised by Christians.—But as long as *Constantius* remained in the subordinate station of *Cæsar*, it was not in his power openly to reject the edicts of *Dioctetian*, or to disobey the commands of *Maximian*.
His

* Page 578. † Our author says in a note (164. c. xvi.) *Dodwell* Dissertat. Cyprian. xi. 75. represents them (*Eusebius* and *Lactantius*) as inconsistent with each other. "But the former evidently speaks of *Constantius* in the station of *Cæsar*, and the latter of the same prince in the rank of *Augustus*." The difference is thus reconciled by *Dodwell* himself.

"Discrepit nonnihil *Lactantius*—Nec id temere. Infra "enim de *Constantino jam Augusto* ita scribit," &c. Mr. D. speaks of the difference as trivial.

DODWELL.

“majorum præceptis vi-
 “deretur, conventicula,
 “id est, parietes, qui
 “restitui poterunt, dirui
 “passus est, verum au-
 “tem Dei templum,
 “quod est in homini-
 “bus, incolume serva-
 “bat.” Nec id temere.
 Infra enim de *Constantio*, jam *Augusto* ita scribit: “Sulcepto imp-
 “rio Constantius Au-
 “gustus nihil egit prius
 “quam Christianos cul-
 “tui ac Deo suo red-
 “dere. Hæc fuit pri-
 “ma ejus sanctio sanctæ
 “religionis restituta.”—
 De M. P. c. 14, 15. In
 eo tamen, uterque con-
 venit nullam fuisse quæ
 martyres fecerit in Con-
 stantii ditione persecu-
 tionem.—Cuncta autem
 quæ trans Alpes erant
 Constantio credita—Er-
 go non *Britannias* modo,
 & *Gallias*, sed *Hispanias*
 regebat †.

GIBBON.

His authority contribut-
 ed, however to alleviate
 the sufferings which he
 pitied and abhorred
 He consented, with re-
 luctance to the ruin of
 the churches; but he
 ventured to protect the
 Christians themselves
 from the fury of the
 populace and from the
 rigour of the laws *.

The *provinces of Gaul*
 (under which we may
 probably include those
 of *Britain*) were in-
 debted for the singular
 tranquility which they
 enjoyed, to the gentle
 interposition of their so-
 vereign. Eusebius l. viii.
 c. 13. Lactantius de M.
 P. c. 15.

The elevation of Con-
 stantius to the supreme
 and independent dignity
 of Augustus, gave a free
 scope to the exercise of
 his virtues, and the
 shortness of his reign
 did not prevent him
 from establishing a sy-
 stem of toleration, &c †.

XX.

We read the same account of *Maxentius* in both these authors.

DODWELL.

“ Eodem tempore *desiit* (persecutio) & in *Italia*. Valedicturus enim imperio *Maximianus* eam, ni fallor, gratiam subditis faciebat quo gravior illis acceptiorque esset ejus memoria. Sequebantur tempora turbulenta usque ad imperium *Maxentii*. Is autem in initio captandæ benevolentia causa revocavit persecutionis edictum Christianumque se simulavit. —Hist. Eccles. viii. 14 *.

GIBBON.

“ The revolt of *Maxentius* immediately restored peace to the churches of *Italy* and *Africa*; and the same tyrant who oppressed every other class of his subjects, shewed himself, just, humane, and even partial, towards the afflicted Christians †. Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14. ‡.

Ita Eusebius :”

XXI.

The persecution of *Maximin* is the next which is treated of by them.

DODWELL.

“ Prodiit tandem edictum *Galerii*, quo persecutio illa penitus extincta est—et quanquam invito *Maximino*, a *Sabino* præf. Orientis, præfectis provincialibus urbibusque

GIBBON.

“ *Galerius* desirous of repairing the mischief that he had occasioned, published—a general edict (of toleration) §.

In the first six months, of his new reign, *Maximin*

* Sect. 77.

§ Page 579.

† Page 577.

‡ Note 167. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

cisque magistratibus communicatum, cum et ipse verbo tenus iudicibus mandasset, ut ab oppugnatione Christianorum abstinerent. Duravit hæc pax ne sex quidem mensibus *—Fatetur à se aliquid illis fuisse indultum *pro more superiorum Imperatorum* †. Inde ad novas artes prætextusque quærendos restaurandæ persecutionis se convertit *Maximinus*.—*Subornavit civitatum ad se legationes magni quasi beneficii loco id à se peti- tum ut Christiani pellerentur, imprimis Antiochiæ, &c.* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. ix. 3. Tum *civitates, quæ id gratum MAXIMINO fore intellexissent, sua etiam iniqua adversus Christianos emis- erunt.* Euseb. ix. 9 ‡

Rescriptis ad illa civitatum decreta, *pellendos esse Christianos.* Qualis fuerit rescripti forma, con-

GIBBON.

imin affected to adopt the prudent counsels of his predecessors.—Sabinus his prætorian præfect addressed a circular letter to all the governors and magistrates of the provinces,—directing the officers of justice to cease their ineffectual persecutions," &c. Euseb. c. ix. 1. §.

But this treacherous calm was of a short duration.—By the influence of the magistrates, and of the sacerdotal order, a great number of dutiful addresses were obtained, particularly from Nicomedia, *Antioch*, and *Tyre*, which artfully represented the well known intentions of the Court as the general sense of the people;—expressed their abhorrence of the *Christians*, and humbly prayed that these impious sectaries might at least be excluded from the limits

* Sect. 82.

† Sect. 82.

‡ Sect. 84.

§ Page 581. Note 174. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

constat ex eo exemplari quo usus est ad Tyrios, quodque æreis tabulis, pro more civitatum, incisum, tradit Eusebius, ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Subjungit enim ejusmodi literas in omnibus provinciis fuisse propositas *. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ix. 7.

—Judices nonnullos in Christianos sæviisse ipse innuit Maximinus, sed præcepta ejus perperam intelligentes. Euseb. ix. 10 §.

GIBBON.

limits of their respective territories.

The answer of Maximin to the address which he obtained from the citizens of Tyre is still extant—his edicts were engraved on tables of brass †. Eusebius l. ix. c. 2—8. Lactant. de M. P. c. 36 ‡.

Maximin imputes all the severities which the Christians suffered to the judges and governors, who had misunderstood his intentions. See the Edict in Eusebius l. ix. c. 10 ||.

XXII.

We find also that the difference in the accounts given us by Eusebius and Lactantius of Maximin's persecution is pointed out to us by Mr. Dodwell as well as by Mr. Gibbon.

DODWELL.

Quod autem, ait Eusebius, hanc Maximini persecutionem priori fuisse multo acerbiorē, nisi candide intelligatur, verum esse vix potest, &c. Hist.

GIBBON.

We read in a note.

“ See Euseb. l. viii. c. 14. l. ix. c. 2.—8. Lactant. de M. P. c. 36. These writers agree in representing the arts of Maximin.”

* Page 328. § Sect. 87.

† Note 175. c. xvi.

‡ Page 581, 582.

|| Note 176. xvi.

DODWELL.

Hist. Eccles. ix. 6 **.

—Una tamen cum illis rescriptis etiam alia ad præfatos provinciarum iudicesque data esse verisimile est, sed *nec illa eadem imperantia.*

“Nam cum clementiam” (inquit Lactantius), “specie tenus “profiteretur, *occidi servos Dei vetuit*, debilitari “jussit.” Lactant. de M. P. n. 36 *.

GIBBON.

Maximin: but the former relates the execution of several martyrs, while the latter expressly affirms,” *occidi servos Dei vetuit* †.”

We thus read of the end put to Maximin's persecution.

DODWELL.

“Jamque persecutioni matura erant omnia ni *Constantinus illum* (Maximinum) *deterruisset.*

Duravit hæc ipsa dissimulatio (Maximini) usque ad nuncium de *profigato à Constantino Max-*

GIBBON.

“But a few months had scarcely elapsed, before the edicts published by *the two western emperors obliged Maximin* to suspend the prosecution of his designs †.

** Sect. 84. See also sect. 90. 81. 86, 87.

* Sect. 84. Mr. Dodwell, however desirous of making the number of martyrs appear small, has scorn'd to have recourse to those arts of misrepresentation, by which our author supports his Hypothesis. Mr. G. should have remembered that Mr. Dodwell says, “Non itaque audebat palam, quod “fecerat antea, (Maximinus) Christianos laniare,” &c.

† Note 175. c. xvi.

† Page 582.

entio

DODWELL.

entio—inde pro auctoritate egit cum *Maximino Constantinus*.*

XXIII.

There is a striking resemblance in what these authors say of the conduct of the magistrates during this persecution.

DODWELL.

“ Ipsa cædium satietas atque *affectedatio* illa quam diximus *incruenti imperii* ad sæviora quidem persecutores consilia, minus tamen martyrum proventu copiosa, convertit.

“ Hæc autem non tantum ideo faciunt, ut gloriari possint, nullum se innocentium peremisse (nam & ipse audiavi aliquos gloriantes, quia administratio sua hac parte fuerit incruenta) sed & invidiæ causa;”

&c. Lactant. Instit. v. 11.†.

GIBBON.

“ There were some governours who from a real or affected *clemency* had preserved their hands unstained with the blood of the faithful §.

“ Ut gloriari possint nullum se innocentium peremisse, nam & ipse audiavi aliquos gloriantes, quia administratio sua, in hac parte, fuerit incruenta.” Lactant. Institut. Divin. v. 11. ||.

* Sect. 86.

† Page 332.

‡ Sect. 80.

§ Page 583. || Note 183. c. xvi. Mr. Dodwell has fairly given us the passage from Lactantius; Mr. G. as I have before shewn, has shamefully distorted and mangled it.

Another

XXIV.

Another particular circumstance is noticed by both these writers.

DODWELL.

" Inde anno viii. tanta crevit *Christianis* in *metallis* constitutis fiducia ut palam collectas celebrarent, *extructis etiam Ecclesiis* *."

GIBBON.

" The confessors who were condemned to work in the mines, were permitted by the humanity or negligence of their keepers, to build chapels, and freely to profess their religion in the ~~middle~~ of those dreary habitations †."

XXV.

As to the remark on Eusebius with which Mr. G. closes this account of the persecutions; I shall content myself with pointing out a sentence or two and beg leave to refer my reader to Mr. Dodwell for the rest.

DODWELL.

" An tamen *magnus* revera fuerit *martyrum* in hac universa persecutione numerus, ita optime judicabimus, si quos

GIBBON.

" Eusebius, de Mart. tyr. Palestin. c. 13. He closes his narration, by assuring us that these were the martyrdoms inflicted

* Page 326.

† Page 583. Mr. G. does not choose to mention what Dodwell says further on this occasion, " Hoc illis novam rursus novi *post Firmilianum* præfetti conflavit invidiam. Inde, " consulto imperatore acceptisque rescriptis, quatuor ex omni " numero selectos ipse vivos comburi consumavit 39. Maximino " destinavit, quos ille uno eodemque die capitibus truncavit. " Reliquos per alia metalla dispersit." p. 326.

DODWELL.

si quos ille *numeros* pro *magnis* habuerit, intelligamus," &c. Euseb. de Mart. Pal. c. 13.

"Videamus—quos ille *numeros* reputarit *mag-nos* in ipsa *Thebaide*—
 ὅτε μὲν πλείονων ἢ δεκά,
 ὅτε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰκοσι—
 ἀλλὰ δὲ οὐχ' ἥττον καὶ
 τριακόντα. ἥδη δὲ ἐγγύς πε
 καὶ ἑξήκοντα, καὶ πάλιν
 ἀλλοτε ἑκατὼν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ
 — ἐκτείνοντο — ΙΣΤΟΡΗ-
 ΣΑΜΕΝ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ
 τῶν τῶν γινόμενοι,
 ΠΛΕΙΟΥΣ ἀθροῦς κατὰ
 μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ, τῆς μὲν τῆς
 κεφαλῆς ἀποτομὴν ΤΗΟ-
 ΜΕΙΝΑΝΤΑΣ, &c. Eu-
 seb. Hist. Eccles. viii.
 10*."

GIBBON.

inflicted in Palestine, during the whole course of the persecution. The vth chapter of his viiith book, which relates to the province of Thebais in Egypt, may seem to contradict our moderate computation, &c.—He relates, that in Thebais, from ten to one hundred persons had frequently suffered martyrdom in the same day.—Instead of a large, but definite number, he speaks of many Christians (*πλείους*) and most artfully selects two ambiguous words (*ιστορησαμεν* and *υπομειναντας*) which may signify either what he had seen, or what he had

heard; either the expectation, or the execution of the punishment †."

XXVI.

I shall conclude the whole of these extracts from Dodwell, by pointing out the following observation, which occurs in each of these authors.

DODWELL.

"—Ita metuebant illi
 (Christiani) ne corona
 illa

GIBBON.

"So great was—the
 fervour of the first Chris-
 tians,

* Sect. 90.

† Note 181. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

illa martyrii exciderent. Sed infinitum esset exempla congerere. Id unum satis est, quod diu est ex quo observavit *Sulpitius Severus*, avidius expetita esse ea ætate martyria quam postea episcopatus *."

GIBBON.

tians, who, according to the lively expression of *Sulpitius Severus*, desired martyrdom with more eagerness, than his own contemporaries solicited a bishopric. †

"Certatim gloriosa in
"certamina ruebatur ;
"multique avidius tum
"martyria gloriosis mor-

"tibus querebantur ; quam nunc episcopatus pravis
"ambitionibus appetuntur." *Sulpicius Severus*,
l. ii. ‡

There are some other passages in Dodwell, which Mr. G. seems to have borrowed ; but I have been obliged to dwell so long on this subject, by comparing their words on the conduct of *each emperor*, that I shall pass over the rest. I flatter myself that I have fully proved to my reader, that the concise account which *Dodwell* has given us of the persecutions of the emperors, has been the chief guide and pattern of our author in this part of his history. It is by his assistance, that he has shewn forth his skill in gracing matters of fact with the beauties of language, while by these beauties he might hope to disguise the many remarks for which he stands indebted to the learning of Dodwell. It is thus, that the creeping ivy entwines itself round a tree, and is enabled to display its verdant foliage, while it hides from our sight the trunk which supports it.

* Page 374.

† Page 551.

‡ Note 91. c. xvi. My reader must instantly perceive that it was no hard task to trace out the passage of Sulpicius, when so much was marked out by *Dodwell*.

Plagiarism from LARDNER.

I have already animadverted on a misrepresentation of Eusebius by Mr. G., and shewn that there is no mention made of *Bruttius Præsens* at the place he refers to. My present design is to fulfil my promise of shewing the probable cause of this error.

Dr. Lardner, in his xiiith chapter on the Testimony of *Bruttius Præsens*, refers to Eusebius iii. 18.; but yet speaks of *Bruttius* as mentioned by Eusebius in his Chronicon. p. 164. in the 15th year of Domitian. This difference our historian seems to have overlooked, and referred to the *History*, instead of the Chronicon.

LARDNER.

“ Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of the persecution under Domitian, says,
 “ Moreover at this time the Doctrine of our faith
 “ was so conspicuous, that writers, adverse to our
 “ sentiments, have not forbore to insert in their
 “ histories an account of his persecution, and the
 “ martyrdoms that happened in it.”

LARDNER.

“ They have likewise exactly marked the time of it, relating, that “ in “ the fifteenth year of “ Domitian *Flavia Domitilla*, niece by the “ sister’s side to *Flavius Clemens*, then one of “ the consuls of Rome, “ with a great many

GIBBON.

“ The emperor (Domitian) for a long time distinguished *Flavius Clemens* by his favour and protection, bestowed on him his own niece Domitilla—and invested him with the honours of the consulship.

“ others

LARDNER.

"others, was banished to the island *Pontia*, for
"the profession of the Christian religion *."

LARDNER.

"In his chronicle, at the fifteenth year of Domitian, *Eusebius* says: "And *Bruttius* writes, "that many Christians suffered martyrdom under Domitian. "Among whom was "Flavia Domitilla, niece "by the sister's side to "Flavius Clemens the consul, who was banished "to the island *Pontia*, because she confessed herself to be a Christian †."

"There were several eminent men of this name (that is *Bruttius Præsens*) in the second century. There is a letter of the younger *Plinie* to *Præsens*, whom some think to have been also called *Brutius* or *Bruttius*." 1. vii. epist. 3.

Tillemont says, "he may have been *Bruttius Præsens*, who was consul in the year 139. or *Præ-*

GIBBON.

"But he had scarcely finished the term of his annual magistracy, when on a slight pretence he was condemned and executed; *Domitilla* was banished to a desolate island on the coast of *Campania*," &c ‡.

"*Bruttius Præsens* (ap. *Euseb.* iii. 18.) banishes her to the isle of *Pontia*, which was not far distant from the other §." That is, from the isle of *Pandetaria*.

"If the *Bruttius Præsens*, from whom it is probable that he collected this account, was the correspondent of *Pliny*, (epistol. vii. 3.) we may consider him as a contemporary writer ||."

* The Greek passage is here transcribed by Lardner from *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 18. † *Chron.* p. 164.

‡ Page 539. § Note 53. c. xvi. || Note 53. c. xvi.

LARDNER.

sens, to whom the younger Plinie wrote : though, as he adds, there were others of the same name about that time."

LARDNER.

Again we read, "Dion Cassius, to be hereafter quoted, will inform us of a *Flavia Domitilla*, wife of the consul *Clement*, who was banished by *Domitian* for Christianity into the island *Pandeteria*, which lay near to *Pontia*, upon the same coast of *Italie*. This has given occasion to a dispute whether there were two of this name, who suffered for Christianity about the

same time. Some supposing one and the same person to be intended, others again contending, that there were two. The matter is of no great importance. Nevertheless, perhaps, we may give it some farther consideration, in the chapter of *Dion Cassius*." *Tillemont Mem. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 126, 127**.

GIBBON.

"*Domitilla* was banished, according to *Dion*, to the isle of *Pandataria*.—That difference, and a mistake either of *Eusebius*, or of his transcribers, have given occasion to suppose two *Domitillas*, the wife and the niece of *Clemens*. See *Tillemont Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, tom. ii. p. 224 †."

We here trace the several remarks which our historian has made on the execution of *Clemens*, on the banishment of *Domitilla*, and on *Bruttius Præsens*: And as he makes mention of them in the manner, and on the same occasion which *Dr. Lard-*

* *Lardner's Testimonies—Heathen Authors*, vol. ii. c. 12.

† Note 52. c. xvi.

ner has done, it gives my charge an appearance more stable than that of conjecture.

Plagiarisms from ABAUZIT.

I bring the first instance, not so much as a proof of plagiarism, for our author has indeed referred to Abauzit, as to shew how servilely he has translated him, and that *Abauzit* has given him the reference to *Epiphanius*.

ABAUZIT.

“ *Les Alogiens, selon S. Epiphane, s'éleverent contre l'Apocalypse qu'ils vouloient ôter à S. Jean, parce disoient-ils entr'autres raisons, que du tems de cet apôtre, il n'y avoit point d'Eglise Chrétienne à Thyatire: ce que S. Epiphane ne craint point de leur accorder, & il suppose en même tems, que lorsque S. Jean écrit à l'Eglise de Thyatire, il parle, non comme si elle existoit alors, mais par un esprit de prophétie.*”
Epiphane Hæres. 51 *.

GIBBON.

“ *The Alogians (Epiphanius de Hæres. 51.) disputed the genuineness of the Apocalypse, because the church of Thyatira was not yet founded. Epiphanius, who allows the fact, extricates himself from the difficulty, by ingeniously supposing, that St. John wrote in the spirit of prophecy. See Abauzit Discours. sur l'Apocalypse†.*”

* Discours Historique sur l'Apocalypse.

† Note 152: c. xv.,

I.

A bare comparison will prove, that what our author has advanced on the subject of the Apocalypse is chiefly taken from *Abauzit*.

ABAUZIT.

“ Mais ce qui prouve que l'Apocalypse n'étoit pas dans le canon des écritures, c'est le concile de Laodicée, le premier que nous connoissons qui ait dressé le catalogue des livres sacrés, tenu vers l'an 360.—L'Apocalypse y

est omise, ce qui est assez surprenant, elle que S. Jean (comme on le croit aujourd'hui,) avoit rédigée par écrit à la prière des Chrétiens d'Asie.—Cette même Apocalypse est méconnue dans le lieu de sa naissance, bannie & proscrire par ces mêmes évêques d'Asie qui se disoient les hérétiques & les successeurs de S. Jean, assemblés à Laodicée, au milieu des sept Eglises à qui le livre étoit adressé, & à qui il rendoit même un si glorieux témoignage.”

GIBBON.

“ In the council of Laodicea (about the year 360) the Apocalypse was tacitly excluded from the sacred canon by the same churches in Asia to which it is addressed.”

II.

ABAUZIT.

“ On ne sauroit non plus faire fonds sur une petite vivacité de Sulpice Sévère, lorsqu'il traite de sous & d'impies ceux qui rejettent l'Apocalypse.—Faut-il être surpris que Sévère ait taxé de folie & d'impiété ceux qui doutoient de l'Apocalypse ? Mais ce qui est plus à

GIBBON.

“ We may learn from the complaint of Sulpicius Severus, that their sentence had been ratified by the greater number of Christians of his time.”

remarquer,

ABAUZIT.

remarquer, c'est que ces faux & ces impies faisoient le plus grand nombre. *La plupart* dit Sévère, *rejettent l'Apocalypse,*" &c.*

The above extract from Abauzit evidently proves, that I happened to discover the right passage, when I pointed out Mr. G.'s misrepresentation of *Sulpicius Severus*: and at the same time it demonstrates the reason that he did not make any particular reference to that author. Abauzit had not specified the place, and as Mr. G. consulted no other original, he knew not how to give us a better direction. Indeed if he had looked at the passage, and found that *Sulpicius Severus* there expressly tells us, that *the Apocalypse was the work of St. John*, he could not have committed so unfortunate a blunder as to cite this Father as saying that *the greater number of Christians* denied its canonical authority.

III.

ABAUZIT.

GIBBON.

"Environs ce tems-là, un Grec inconnu se couvroit du beau nom de S. Denys l'Aréopagite, pour donner à ses fictions le poids & l'âge de la vérité.—Cependant comme la supposition étoit grossière, elle ne fût pas d'abord goûtée dans son pays natal: mais elle trouva un climat plus favorable en occident. Papes,

"The Greeks were subdued by the authority of an impostor, who, in the sixth century, assumed the character of Dionysius the Areopagite †."

* Sect. 81, p. 297, 298.

† Note 65. c. xv.

ABAUZIT.

conciles, souverains, la reçurent avec grand respect, & le monde Latin admira la profonde doctrine du prétendu Arcopagite*.

I had passed over this reason which Mr. Gibbon assigns for the reception of the Apocalypse in the Greek church; because, as he had cited no testimony for his assertion, it was foreign to my purpose to take notice of his remark: But now I have more effectually proved my point by shewing whence he gained his information.

In the advertisement prefixed to *Abauzit's* discourse on the Apocalypse it is very frankly acknowledged, that "he undertook it with the view of pointing out the difficulties that may be raised against it, and the contests occasioned by a doubt of its authenticity, and to overthrow the testimony of the Fathers concerning it." We need not wonder, therefore, that our author should readily adopt his remarks, nor, after so long a series of Plagiarisms as I have exposed, that he should endeavour to conceal his obligations.

From *Dr. Middleton's letter to Dr. Waterland*, our author has gained the subsequent passage:

MIDDLETON.

"Herodotus tells us, —
"that the Phœnicians
"and Syrians who inhabited
"Palestine, (that is,
"the Jews) confessed, that
"they had received the
"system of circumcision
"from

GIBBON.

"Herodotus, who visited Asia whilst it obeyed the last of those empires, slightly mentions the Syrians of Palestine, who, according to their own confession, had received from

MIDDLETON.

"from the Egyptians."
 Vid. Herod. l. 2. c.
 104 *."

GIBBON.

ceived from Egypt the rite
 of circumcision."
 See l. 2. c. 104†:

Our author has adopted many of Dr. Middleton's opinions respecting the Jews; I shall give one specimen.

MIDDLETON.

"The Jews, on the other hand, were an obscure contemptible people, famed for no kind of literature; scarce known to the polite world, till the Roman empire dispersed them; and then the more despised only for being known."

• Tacit. Hist. v. 3.
 • Justin. Hist. l. 36. c.
 2. †

GIBBON.

The Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies, had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from obscurity under the successors of Alexander; and—soon excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations §."

Tacit. Hist. v. 1—9.
 Justin. 36. 2, 3 ||.

Lx

• Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 26.

See the refutation of this opinion by the late Bp. Pearce in his *Reply to the Letter to Dr. Waterland*, p. 13.

†. Note 1. c. xv.

§ Page 451.

|| Note 2. c. xv.

‡ P. 29 Letter to Dr. Waterland.

I have already fully shewn the assistance Mr. G. has received from the *Free Inquiry* of his friend Dr. Middleton; yet great as his opinion is of him, it has not prevailed on our historians to profit by his admonition. Speaking of the infidel author of *Christianity as old as the Creation*, he says, "And this may serve withal to shew his ignorance of antiquity, in magnifying, as he does on all occasions, the moderation of pagan governments, in opposition to Christian; that they indulged an universal liberty, never persecuted for religion, never quarrelled"

"led

It was agreeable to our author's design to adopt such a dark character of the Jews: He indeed discovers his inclinations by the choice of his authors.

After so long a detail of convincing proofs, I think no doubt can remain, that our author, with all his pretensions to originality, must stand convicted as a servile plagiary. Nor let any one fancy, that it cost him much labour or skill to make such a display of erudition: nothing more was requisite than to drop one single link of the chain; to omit mentioning the name of his modern friends, through whose channel he had any acquaintance with the ancient writers on the subjects he treated of, and to make the boldest and most frequent appeals to those ancients, as if he himself had painfully turned over all their works. I have, I hope, sufficiently established the certainty of this his mode of proceeding; but I cannot dismiss this charge against him without informing the reader, that in one instance, by an unaccountable oversight, he has, unfortunately for himself, forgot to drop the modern, and modestly disclaims all knowledge of *Athanasius*, but what he has picked up from *Tillemont*.

TILLEMONT.

"Dieu fit aussi eclater à la honte des mauvais Chrétiens la générosité de quelques infidèles, qui

GIBBON.

"Heavy penalties were denounced against all who should presume to save a proscribed sectary

"led about their Gods; for he quite mistakes the matter; it is not the *believers of religion*, but *infidels and atheists*, who in every country have always been the *severest persecutors*, and *cruelest oppressors* of all civil as well as religious liberty." He proves his assertion by several examples. Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 54. See also p. 64.

TILLEMONT.

qui ayant reçu chez eux des Chrétiens que l'on cherchoit, eurent autant de soin de les cacher qu'ils en eussent pu avoir pour eux-mêmes, & ne craignirent point de perdre de l'argent, de souffrir la prison, & de s'exposer même à la mort, plutôt que de trahir ceux qui s'étoient confiés à leur foy." Athanas. solit. p. 853 *.

GIBBON.

tary from the just indignation of the Gods, and of the emperors. Yet notwithstanding the severity of this law, the virtuous courage of many of the pagans, in concealing their friends or relations, affords an honourable proof, that the rage of superstition had not extinguished in their minds the sentiments of nature and humanity †."

Athanasius, p. 833. ap. Tillemont Memoires Ecclesiastiques, tom. v. part 1. p. 90 †.

These proofs of our author's plagiarism which I have produced, as undeniable as they are numerous, I might still extend, by tracing him more closely. But I trust that I have sufficiently convinced every unbiassed person, within how narrow a compass the boasted extent of Mr. G.'s reading is contained. It might be very proper to present his readers with a body of notes, stuffed with a disgusting farrago of ancient learning; but he could employ his time better than by really examining the musty Fathers, whose writings he so frequently appeals to. *Middleton* could afford some topics of abuse; *Barbeyrac* had others ready prepared for his purpose; and *Dadwell*, in one dissertation, had collected erudition enough to furnish the far

* Tillemont Mem. Eccles. tom. v. p. 55. 4to. edit.

† Page 575.

† Note 163. c. xvi.

greater part of the materials for his sixteenth chapter. And I think I may boldly assert, that if I had added *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, and *Dupin's Bibliotheque*, to my list of Mr. G.'s modern friends, I should hardly have left him a single sentence of his own to boast of in his two famous chapters, which were to give the death-wound to Christianity. In short, were I to restore to each of them the passages which Mr. G. has purloined, he would appear as naked as the proud and gaudy daw in the fable, when each bird had plucked away his own plume. The witty poet tells us what censure such proceedings merit,

———“ Moveat cornicula risum
“ Furtivis nudata coloribus.”———

I have now completed the task I proposed to execute; which was not to confute Mr. G.'s arguments against the divine original of Christianity; but to expose the indefensible arts to which he has recourse in supporting them; and to strip them of their boasted novelty, by restoring his pilfered erudition to their proper owners. Before I conclude, however, it may not be without its use to quiet the apprehensions of many a sincere, but, I must add, ill-instructed Christian, who, imposed upon by our historian's parade of quotation and elegance of composition, have done him, what I must think, the unmerited honour of considering him as an adversary who had produced something of importance, unknown to his predecessors in the cause of infidelity, and which the friends of the Gospel would find it difficult to confute.—Be it observed, therefore, that Mr. G. does not give

* *Mosheim, de rebus Christianorum ante Constantin. M.*

himself the trouble of starting any new objection against the truth of Christianity, but that his whole plan of *accounting for its progress from secondary causes* is a stale infidel topic, urged and confuted long before he was born*. As a proof of this, the reader will, I believe, thank me for the following extract from a sermon of bishop Atterbury.

“ *Miraculous* it certainly was (to use the bishop’s words), because the *natural* and visible causes which concurred to the production of this great effect, were not any ways equal to the effect produced; and therefore, some *supernatural* and invisible cause must needs have given birth to it.

“ But let us hear what causes, they say, conspired together to produce this wonderful effect.” From the weakness and insufficiency of these the bishop thus deduces the proof of the miraculous propagation.

“ In which truth (viz. the miraculous propagation of the Gospel) that we may be yet farther confirmed, let us consider what *shifts* the enemies of the gospel make use of, to evade the force of

* The following concise passages from *M. Heim*, (who is spoken of so highly on many occasions by our historian,) may with propriety be given to my readers, to shew that his sentiment on this subject is as widely different from Mr. G.’s, as it is more rational, more pious, and more grateful. They are thus translated by *MacLaine*.

“ When we consider the rapid progress of Christianity among the Gentile nations, and the poor feeble instruments by which this great and amazing event was immediately effected, *we must naturally have recourse to an omnipotent and invisible hand; as its true and proper cause,*” &c.

“ Such then were the *true* causes of that amazing rapidity with which the Christian religion spread itself upon the earth; and those *who pretend to assign other reasons* of this surprizing event, *indulge themselves in idle fictions*, which must disgust every attentive observer of men and things.” Sect. 8. 1c.

this pressing argument. And the utmost that any of them pretend to say, is as follows : It is true, they will own, Christians multiplied very fast, and the increase of them was, in some sense, *miraculous* : That is, it was *wonderful* ; as every unusual thing is to those, who do not know, or consider the causes of it. But to a man, they say, who dares go out of the common road, and to think for himself, it will appear, that there was at that time a set of *natural* causes on foot, sufficient to account for this effect, without any recourse to a *divine* and *supernatural* agent. The apostles indeed were twelve plain illiterate men, who had not, of themselves, force or skill enough, to bring about such an event : But their natural inability was supplied by a favourable juncture, by a happy coincidence of such conspiring causes, and accidental advantages, as mightily helped on the work.

“ For example——

“ The *purity of the Christian morals* was a mighty argument to bring the men of probity and virtue into the interests of the Gospel.

“ The *distribution of goods*, which the first Christians made, and their living together in common, was a good reason for many men's embracing that faith, which, they were sure, would maintain them.—In the mean while, the *rulers* of the world *overlooked*, and *neglected to crush*, a doctrine, which was, so harmless in itself, and so unlikely to succeed on the account of its abettors ; till, through their connivance, it was at last universally received among the vulgar sort, and the number of its votaries was grown so formidable, that even princes themselves were forced, for their own ease and interest, to come into it, and profess it.

“ And thus, say they, several extraordinary and unheeded advantages concurring, to favour the growth of Christianity, it grew indeed *mightily*, and prevailed ;

prevailed; as a little river will swell high, and spread itself wide, and run far, when swollen by casual rains, and by many other streams, which have emptied themselves at once into it. Such is the account they pretend to give of the rise and progress of our faith, from *second causes*, without calling a *first*, to solve the appearance.

“ The *purity of the Christian morals*, and the answerable lives of Christian converts, did indeed very naturally lead men to admire and value the doctrine of Christ, but by no means to come under the yoke of it: for though most men have an esteem for strict rules, and strict lives; yet few care to practise the one, or to imitate the other. And nothing, I think, could be contrived so effectual (next to the former wise motive from the sufferings of the martyrs) to *deter* men from Christianity, as to tell them, that, when they took it upon them, they must renounce their dearest appetites and passions, and deny their very selves. And I desire the men, who raise these objections against the divine original of the Gospel, to tell us fairly, whether, if they had lived at that time, they would have come in upon *this* principle? I am sure they would not; because it is *this* principle alone (that they must part with their unlawful satisfactions and pleasures, if they do) which keeps them out of it now. Therefore neither can this be any sufficient reason for the sudden and wide growth of Christianity.

“ Again, neither can any probable account be given of this matter, from the *charitable distribution of their goods, which the first Christians made*. For, supposing that some of the poorer sort might be tempted by this motive; yet, surely, those who had wherewithal to sustain themselves, and were easy in their circumstances, did not come in upon it: It will not, be said, I hope, that such as *made* this

this distribution of their goods (which will be found to have been an inconsiderable number) came in themselves to *partake* of it. Nor could these hopes have any great influence, even on the meaner sort; since there was something in the Christian religion, of far more force to frighten them, than this was to allure them; the strict rules of honesty and temperance, according to which they were bound to live, and the great calamities and persecutions which they were sure to undergo.

“ Lastly, No weight can be laid in this case, on that *contempt*, which the *heathen princes* are said to have had of the *Christian religion*, and the little care they, therefore, took to restrain it; for it is not true, that they stood by unconcerned at it's growth; on the contrary, it is certain, that they looked upon it with a jealous eye, from its first rise; and the early persecutions of *Nero* (not to mention those of *Domitian*, which were after the destruction of *Jerusalem*) shew that he took great notice of it, and endeavoured to extirpate it. However, let the Roman emperors have been never so regardless of its increase; yet it is certain, that they did no ways countenance it; and that every one, who turned Christian, was sure by that means to forfeit the favour of his prince, and to be looked upon as an apostate from the religion of his country. And how, even under such a pressure as this, could Christianity have made so rapid and astonishing a progress; if He, who is mightier than the mightiest, had not bid it *go forth and prosper* against all human discouragements? Had *this counsel*, or *this work* been of Men, it would, even without any direct opposition from the temporal power, have certainly *come to nought*, as *Gamaliel* argued; *but being of God, nothing could overthrow it.*

" I do not deny after all, but that every one of these particulars might in a natural way contribute somewhat, either to the planting, or spreading of the Gospel. But I think it is evident, from the short hints I have suggested to you, that all of them together were not able to do the thousandth part of that work, which is allotted to them. And, therefore, to resolve this great event into a *conspiracy of second causes*, as it is called, without any regard to the *first*, is an *absurd and senseless attempt*; and only shews us, how very strong an inclination and bias there is in some minds towards *infidelity*, which they can be brought to espouse upon so very slight grounds.

" A man, who should see an acorn put into the earth, and perceive in a few weeks, or months, an oak shooting up from it to a prodigious height, and spreading its branches to an amazing extent, so as to overtop the loftiest mountains, and even to cover the whole field where it grew; might as well say, that there was a *strange conspiracy of natural causes*, an extraordinary degree of warmth, moisture, and so forth, which concurred to produce this effect; as affirm, that the vast success of the Gospel was owing to those *petty principles*, from whence some men pretend to derive it*."

And now, upon a review of the charges which I have urged against Mr. G., I think I cannot better address him than in the words of bishop Pearce, on a similar occasion, to Dr. Middleton.

" By this time, Sir, the reader I believe has fully seen how little credit your writings deserve in their appeals to the authors which you cite†.—You have hardly made one *original* quotation of an author in his true sense, very often in the sense most

* Bp. Atterbury, *serm.* iii. vol. i.

† Reply to the Defence of a Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 46.

opposite to his true one ; and *have represented not only passages, but facts too, in so wrong a light*, that, whatever you searched for, it is plain you missed of truth †.—But in God's name, Sir, is any cause worth such a proceeding ? can a good one want falsehoods ? or does a bad one deserve them ? Let facts, of whatever kind, be sifted thoroughly, and examined freely ; but let impartiality always go along with the search, and let it always be thought one ingredient in free-thinking, to follow truth in every inquiry : He that suffers himself to be imposed upon, or tries to impose upon others, has no right to the title of a free-thinker ‡.”

With what justice I have applied these words to our author, I leave those to determine who have perused my Examination. One would think that Mr. G. had deemed his studied elegance of style alone sufficient to compensate for unfair quotation and false assertion. But surely it is not the lengthened period, the flow of polished words, the harmonious diction, which can of themselves constitute the character of a good historian. These indeed serve to amuse the fancy, and delight the ear : Yet they conduce little to our information or instruction ; but, rather, beguile the judgment of the unwary. It is *the indispensable duty* of an historian, to give a fair and impartial relation of facts, and to support this relation by citing the testimony of credible authors. I might add to this, that accuracy and impartiality are peculiarly requisite in a writer whose subject leads him to enter upon an investigation of the truth of religion, which is so intimately connected with the most important interests of mankind.

“ The historian,” says the ingenious and elegant author of the *History of America*, “ who deline-

† Reply to a Letter to Dr. W. p. 7.

‡ Ibid. p. 40.

ates the transactions of a remote period, has *no title to claim assent*, unless he produces evidence in proof of his assertions. Without this, he may write an *amusing tale*, but cannot be said to have composed an authentic history." Excellent and just reflection! how unhappily applied to Mr. Gibbon!

"In these sentiments," continues Dr. Robertson, "I have been confirmed by the opinion of an author, (Mr. Gibbon) whom his industry, erudition, and discernment, have deservedly placed in a high rank among the most eminent historians of the age*."

Will the reader of the foregoing sheets agree with the Doctor in his compliment? What *industry* can Mr. G. lay claim to, whose researches, we fear, notwithstanding all his pretences, have been lazily confined within so narrow a circle? What *erudition* can he boast of, whom we have convicted of inaccuracies so striking as to be scarcely pardonable in any one who would pass for a scholar? And what *discernment* can he be said to possess, who, not satisfied with "being placed in a high rank among the most eminent historians of the age," chose to relinquish that superiority of fame, and to be handed down to posterity, as a very insidious, but a very superficial advocate of infidelity, the retailer of obsolete sneers against sacred truths, the misrepresenter of venerable antiquity, and the plagiary of modern compilers?

Mr. G. has indeed written "*a tale amusing*" enough to Unbelievers and Free thinkers, but "*he cannot be said to have composed an authentic history: he has no title to claim assent, unless he produces evidence in proof of his assertions.*" What pity is it then that the *reverend and courtly* historian, through politeness, should have made a

* See the preface to Dr. Robertson's History of America.

needless digression, to bestow *applause*, before he had examined whether *censure* was not rather due?

I mean not to represent *Dr. Robertson* as singular in this high tone of compliment to *Mr. Gibben*. He has only spoken the language of others who have professedly answered him.

May I be permitted, before I conclude, to hazard it as my opinion, that this civility has been carried beyond all due bounds; and that our historian is entirely indebted for his supposed eminence among the enemies of the gospel, to the over candid encomiums of some of its friends? When men of learning, and good Christians, tell us, that he is "respectable for his *great merits*, "*—of real eminence in learning as well as composition*,"—and *applaud the erudition with which the materials (of his history) are compiled*†;" it consequently elevates his fame, and bestows upon him an unmerited consequence, which may puzzle the ignorant, and seduce the unwary believer. It is thus that the credulous superstition of former ages, arising from their ignorance of philosophy, attributed to the glaring comets a malignant influence, and caused them to be viewed with a groundless horror as tokens of impending danger.

* When we reflect on the great credit, which has been given to Mr. G. chiefly, for his elegance of style, we may justly apply to him the words of Bp. Jewell. "*Ut cum eleganter, et copiose ageretur, homines imperiti possent in eâ aliquid esse suspicari.*" Jaell. Apolog. pro Eccles. Anglican.

† The same author, who pays Mr. G. these compliments, tells us, that "he has adopted an entertaining but *superficial* manner of writing history," and agrees with me, that he "gives himself the privilege of *mutilating*, and selecting, and *arranging at discretion*, the records of past ages."

I shall

A
R E P L Y
T O
M R. G I B B O N ' s
V I N D I C A T I O N
O F

*Some Passages in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth
Chapters of "The History of the Decline
and Fall of the Roman Empire."*

W H E R E I N

The C H A R G E S brought against him in the
E X A M I N A T I O N

A R E C O N F I R M E D,

And further Instances given of his

M I S R E P R E S E N T A T I O N, I N A C C U R A C Y, and P L A G I A R I S M.

B Y H E N R Y E D W A R D S D A V I S, B. A.
O F B A L L I O L C O L L E G E, O X F O R D.

" Nam cum magna malæ superest audacia causæ

" Creditur a multis fiducia."

J U V E N A L.

L O N D O N :
P R I N T E D F O R J. D O D S L E Y, I N P A L L - M A L L.
M D C C L X X I X.

E R R A T A.

- Page 25. line 16. for *artack* read *attack*.
 — 27. note, for *l. xv.* read *c. xv.*
 — 34. note †, line ult. for ψυλαφησατι read ψηλαφησατι.
 — 35. note, line 18, for *his* read *hic*.
 — 59. line 14, 15, for *ap-spear* read *appear*
 — 60. line 28, read “ *mutilating and mis-translating*.
 — 70. for Article XXI. read XXII.
 — 75. for Article XXII. read XXIII.
 — 77. note †, for *sosento* read *sosentō*.
 — Ibid. note †, for *disfitions* read *distinctions*.
 — 80. note, line 4, for *infra scripti* read *infra scripti*.
 — 91. line 4, read *than*.
 — 130. note †, line 5, for αρτιο λεθριας read αντι ολεθριας.
 — 153. line 11, read *practice*.
 — Ibid. line 15, read *esteemed it*.

A

R E P L Y, &c.

WHEN a writer contends not for personal victory, but for the establishment of a just cause; so far as the means used may have failed, or the mode adopted by him have been improperly applied, ever open to conviction, he is ready to accept the corrections even of a foe.

I engaged in this controversy, actuated by a motive very different from that which influenced Mr. Gibbon. He now openly confesses that he wrote for fame *. A singularity of opinion, and a seeming novelty of sentiment, were therefore necessary to distinguish the man; and of course the more bold the enterprise, the more glorious the success. To subvert Christianity was an undertaking worthy the abilities of Mr. Gibbon, and to amuse men out of their religion, or make them sit easy and indifferent to it, was an achievement truly heroic. More able persons had con-

* His expression is emphatic: "FAME is the motive, it is the reward of our labours; nor can I easily comprehend how it is possible that we should remain cold and indifferent with regard to the attempts which are made to deprive us of the most valuable object of our possessions, or at least of our hopes." *Vind.* p. 4.

N. B. The first edition of the *Vindication* is generally quoted.

B

futed

futed his principles, and shewn the insufficiency of his arguments: it was my part, to point out his indefensible mode of supporting the attack. Unfortunately, I am myself charged with being guilty of the same faults *; but I trust that every candid and impartial reader will allow the truth of my *general* charge, though the *Vindication* points out some mistakes, which shall be acknowledged in the course of this *Reply*.

By my adversary I am represented as destitute of candour as well as discretion: my deficiency in the latter qualification is but too much felt by myself; yet conscious as I am of no dissingenuity, I can despise his angry invective and malevolent insinuation. Granting that I have been mistaken in some points, and too bold in some of my assertions; much may be said to extenuate my offence. Nay Mr. Gibbon himself, in his *Vindication*, suggests to me some topics of apology.

Part of what he says is this: that "a young student, who consults an author, cannot always be guided by the most accurate reference to the knowledge of the sense †."

And again, that "I set out with the stock of

* In the famous controversy between Dr. *Middleton*, and the late Bishop *Pearce*, the Bishop produced *fifteen* instances of falshood "in his quotations and historical facts;" but the ingenuity of the Doctor endeavoured to evade the charge, and allowed but "a *poor single one* to be left, in which," says he, "you have shewn some want of attention, or too much haste in me, but no possible suspicion of any wilful misrepresentation." (*Defence of Letter to Dr. Waterland*, p. 59. *Reply to the Letter, &c.* p. 6.)

Now, though we may judge differently from Mr. Gibbon of the truth and success of the controversy between them; (See *Vind.* p. 104.) yet, after this, the candid reader will not, perhaps, be so much surprised to hear of Mr. Gibbon's manner of treating me in his *Vindication*.

† *Vind.* p. 10.

“ authorities which I found in his quotations *.”
 —But is he aware of the conclusion which must be drawn from hence? Had he properly supported his claim to “ the merits of *diligence* and *accuracy*,” his references and quotations could not have led me into error. It was not probable that a young student should have perused the *whole* of the many and large folios which I had cited, before my unfinished studies had been *honoured* with the humble, the *offensive* title of Bachelor of Arts †; I therefore apologised, at the conclusion of my examination, for my juvenile production; only laying claim to the small merit of being able to read the languages, and to compare the passages, to which Mr. G. had referred, with his text. If, therefore, our historian had been just, fair, and accurate, there was hardly room for a mistake.

I might plead the almost unavoidable slips which the most skilful compiler will be liable to make, searching through a variety of volumes, and consulting different editions, comparing and extracting a multiplicity of detached quotations; slips, which an unexperienced young man would more naturally make, labouring without proper assistance and helps, and hastening on with youthful eagerness, too rapidly, to the press; before he had time to arrange, or even to correct, his rough materials; apprehensive lest all his labours should become useless, by an abler champion getting before him, in the same walk of an examination of Mr. Gibbon’s authorities.

When this real state of the case is considered, the few mistakes I have been guilty of will not,

* Vind. p. 101.

† Mr. G. says, “ *He styles himself* a Bachelor of Arts, &c. Vind. p. 1.

perhaps, be looked upon by the candid as the offspring of artifice and malice.

There is, indeed, something so very improbable in the supposition, that it hardly needs a confutation. Let Mr. Gibbon, for a moment, reflect what absurdity it implies : The historian still alive—of noted character—who was invited by the very title of my book to hear, and was able to retort, the charge, had it been *false*. Say then, what hope was there of impunity? or what inducement to swell the detail, already too tedious, of his misrepresentations and inaccuracies, (the reality of which I had firmly established) by unnecessarily having recourse to any that *I knew* to be but imaginary.

While I thus freely confess some errors that I have fallen into in my *Examination* of Mr. Gibbon's references, the reader should be reminded, that I still contend for the substantial grounds of the general charge; still I insist, that many *Inaccuracies* remain unnoticed, many *Misrepresentations* unaccounted for, by him; enough, I am confident, were I even to give up without a dispute all that he has called in question, to convince the world, that I have totally set aside his boasted claim to the merits of *accuracy* and *originality*.

But before I enter on this, let me be indulged a word or two with respect to the loud and weighty complaint of Mr. Gibbon, that "I have repeatedly applied to the historian some of the harshest epithets in the English language;—that I have prosecuted a religious crusade—with implacable spirit, and with acrimony of stile*."

Some may, perhaps, think, that warmth of expression is, in this case, the just and proper language of

* Vindication throughout.

the heart, and gives energy to sentiments, which flow from the powerful conviction of truth. If so, they will not be disposed to pass a very severe censure upon the indignation which a young writer felt, when encountering an author whom he had but too good reason to consider as an underminer of that religion on which mankind may build better hopes, and which affords more valuable objects of them, than Mr. Gibbon's unsubstantial bubble of fame*.

My own sentiments cannot be better expressed, than in the words of a judicious and spirited writer: *The author of the Examination* "is not one of those cool opposers of infidelity, who can reason without earnestness, and confute without warmth. He leaves it to others, to the *soft divine* and *courtly controversialist*, to combat the most flagitious tenets with serenity—For himself, he freely owns he is apt to *kindle* as he writes; and would even blush to repel an insult on sense and virtue with less vigour than every honest man is expected to shew in his own cause †."

The Historian now openly confesses, "he had reason to expect that this obnoxious part would provoke the zeal of those who consider themselves as watchmen of the Holy City ‡." If such were his own ideas of the matter, I know not how he can call either mine, or any other, an *unprovoked* attack: he, surely, had reason to expect that he should not escape with impunity, but that they would go forth and seek a foe; who, *assuming the form of an angel of light*, had deceived

* Vind. p. 4.

† Remarks on Mr. Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion, p. 12.

‡ Vind. p. 3.

even some of the guards, and *deluded an easy public*, until the spear of truth touched him to the quick, and forced him to throw off his disguise.

This defence *I might urge for my acrimony of stile, as our Author terms it; and to the public perhaps it may be in some degree necessary. With respect to Mr. Gibbon himself, I may challenge him to produce from my *Examination* more illiberal and personal expressions or reflections, than such as frequently occur in his mild *Vindication*; and, since he complains so much on this head, it should seem that it became him to set an example of the moderation which he commends *.

There is another, and that a prudential, reason, why this would have been proper. The countryman who was present at an academical disputation, though he did not understand the learned language it was held in, had yet good reason for saying that he could be certain one of the disputants thought himself in the wrong, because he had worked himself up into all the emotions of passion, and discovered all the impatience of anger. Had Mr. Gibbon answered my *Examination* without expressing so much peevishness and resentment; his readers in general would have been less disposed to believe that many of my charges affected him deeply. But from the high tone of anger in which he inveighs against me and my associates, many will be apt to suspect that he was stung with the truth of my accusation. It was far from being my design to enrage him to such a degree; I contended only with the *historian*, and am sorry to have touched him so sensibly as it seems I have done, in his private character of a *gentleman*.

* See *Vindication*, p. 6. 8. 16. 41. 57. 91, &c. &c.

I will

I will endeavour therefore, for my own sake as well as my adversary's, to preserve my temper, and refrain from those mean invectives which disgrace his *Vindication*; and for which the inevitable tendency of dispute, which he pleads, will not sufficiently apologise. Not that I mean to give up the truth of my argument through undue complaisance; but while I confute his assertions, I shall forbear the most distant *personal* allusion.

In justice to the artful mode of his *Vindication*, I am bound to return his compliment with increase; for "it is contrived with *more than tolerable* skill to confound the ignorance and candour of his readers*." He has taken many months to consider of the defence which he might most securely adopt; and though he has doubtless pointed out *some* false charges, he frequently flies off from the first question, and employs much art and evasion to draw off the attention of the reader from the material point in debate, to which he knows he cannot give a satisfactory reply, to less important circumstances, in which he can shew his adversary was mistaken. This is always the sign of a bad cause. A skilful advocate, who knows the merits are against his client, ever endeavours to keep the principal object from the observation of the court; and if the opposite side, with all the superiority of law and equity, have unfortunately committed some little irregularity in their proceedings, or failed in proving some subordinate matters, inadvertently brought forward in the cause; by expatiating on these, and exaggerating their importance with pomp of words and confidence of assertion, he hopes to confound the

* Vind. p. 7.

jury and obtain a verdict. But the discerning arbiter sees through such flimsy artifices of sophistry, which may shew the abilities of the pleader, but cannot alter the foundations of the cause. Such most certainly has been Mr. Gibbon's mode of vindicating himself. He is ever endeavouring at plausible glosses, but he carefully avoids attempting to shake the foundation of the charge; and, not ignorant of the favour and admiration with which his style has been received by many, he aims at amusing the ear without convincing the understanding, and substitutes sophistry instead of argument.

It must be confessed, that he displays a degree of modesty in the title of his *Vindication*, which it seems is confined to *some* passages only; and we might have hoped it proceeded from a consciousness of his not being able to refute *all* the charges brought against him, and from a conviction of his errors; if he had not asserted that "the few imputations which he has neglected are still more palpably false, or still more evidently trifling*." To this affectation of sparing me, I shall only say, that my opponent does not indicate the most forgiving temper; on the contrary, his implacable resentment gives me reason to imagine that he was not merciful in a single instance where he discovered an error. He had time to sift thoroughly every particular, and that he condescended to be sufficiently minute, the course of this *Reply* will abundantly prove. I shall therefore take it for granted that the numerous imputations which Mr. G. affects to have neglected as false or trifling, he found so strongly supported, that all the powers of his eloquence could not

* Wind. p. 96.

weaken

weaken their force. As my adversary has artfully kept these from sight, it is my business to bring them forward, that the reader may be sensible of their number and importance.

This advocate for infidelity forgets, it should seem, how greatly the bias of principle will affect the judgment; and he is not the first author, even of great character, who has perverted, either purposely or undesignedly, the testimony of authors, ancient as well as modern, to satisfy a groundless antipathy against the doctrines and professors of Christianity. Modern infidels and sceptics, when driven from the possibility of deceiving by conclusions more specious than true, or disguising sacred truths by the fallies of indecent wit and pleasantry, have often judged it expedient to have recourse to the pretended sanction of history †.

The

† The Learned Dr. *Burgh* has marked out (in his *Inquiry into the Belief of the Christians of the three first centuries*) this peculiar conduct in some of our modern historians. Our author is one of them; and though he did not think proper to encounter this able champion, among those whom “*he has saluted with stern defiance, or gentle courtesy*,” (Vind. p. 91.) I shall produce his words, as those of a layman, for a proof that “the obnoxious part of Mr. G.’s history does not provoke the zeal of those *only* who consider themselves as watchmen of the Holy City.”

“Whatever occurs, says Dr. *Burgh*, in the antient writers of history, of a speculative nature, we find to be an inference from a fact stated, without any seeming view to the deduction, but to the unadulterated representation of which the historian appears to have religiously attended. Whatever occurs in the modern writers of history of a narrative nature, we find to be an inference from a system previously assumed, without any seeming view to the truths of the fact recorded, but to the establishment of which the historian appears, *through every species of misrepresentation*, to have zealously directed his force. The late Mr. *Hume*, for instance, converted the history of this nation into a defence of the Stuarts’ principles of government: to this end he has adduced facts only

The plausibility of their practice seems to have prevailed with Mr. Gibbon; but I do not see why he should be quite so positive and dogmatical: for matters of fact are stubborn, and not easily made to bend even by the power of his rhetoric. In the fabulous ages of antiquity, woods and rocks were said to have been moved by the harmony of an Orpheus or an Amphion; in other words, the Poet or Historian had a licence of representing facts as it suited their purpose, or pleased their imagination. We now require proofs to authenticate assertions, and something more in-

only as arguments, has warped the train of events from the real course of succession, and, in order to render them subservient to his predetermined conclusion, has bestowed on each that false colouring which may give it, in some degree, the appearance of a case in point. A similar plan has been since pursued; and as the subversion of freedom was the evident purpose of Mr. Hume in writing *the History of England*, so, I fear, we may with too much justice affirm the subversion of Christianity to be the object of Mr. Gibbon in writing *the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. As a narrative founded on the authority of ancient writers must have defeated his end, it is curious to observe the subtlety and variety of those artifices with which this gentleman has endeavoured to work away their credit, and thus to obtain a favourable reception for his own *substituted conjectures*, as a superior ground of history.

To one alone I shall now advert, because it has been directed against the veracity of that Father who is immediately under my consideration (Justin Martyr). It is briefly this: When an ancient, and particularly a Christian writer, makes an assertion, the admission of which might be found inconsistent with Mr. Gibbon's hypothesis, he feigns a position which may shake the faith of his reader, and, ascribing this to the author from whose pen it never flowed, descants on his credulity, and inculcates the necessity of standing on our guard against the danger of too implicit confidence in one at the least liable to imposition, and whose authority is therefore not sufficient to remove the perplexities thus introduced into the sceptical mind." *Inquiry*, p. 70, 8vo. Lond. 1778.

fallible

fallible than the melody of a well-rounded period.

“ The Historian of the Roman Empire” might with a hope of security play his popular reputation against the character of a Bachelor of Arts; but when several agree in their testimony, of whom all are not so ignorant of history as he would represent them, and give evident proofs of his *Misrepresentations* and *Plagiarism*; there are some in the world who will be apt to conclude, perhaps not without reason, that this concurring evidence must overbalance the haughty and peremptory assertions even of our learned Author.

I lament no less than Mr. Gibbon, that in the prosecution of this *Reply*, I must be obliged to repeat often what he calls “ *the vainest and most disgusting of the pronouns* † :” having not the least pretensions to the high-sounding title of *the Historian of the Roman Empire*, which serves to supply with honourable pomp (I presume not to say with how much justice) the name of my adversary. Let him consider what the appellation implies, and discharge his duty accordingly. It was formerly said, “ an Historian should be of no country :” it is equally necessary that he should be fair and impartial, and without bias or prejudice in matters of religion.

Surely it was policy in Mr. Gibbon, after such positive assertions of his own innocence, and that the accusations of his adversaries were calumnious and groundless, to disclaim *for ever* the odious controversy. I might press him to give substantial reasons for this resolution; the cause of truth is ever to be defended, and will sustain unshaken the most impetuous attacks of its enemies. Fal-

† Vind. p. 8.

lacy and artifice alone decline the fair and open trial, and dread the event of a minute scrutiny.

Mr. Gibbon therefore must not think it unreasonable that I, in my turn, should make my defence, and confirm my former charges.

Quotations in general.

The first point which Mr. Gibbon attempts to defend is his mode of quotation, his loose way of reference, which I had represented as “a good artifice to escape detection; a policy not without its design and use; as, by endeavouring to deprive us of the means of comparing him with the authorities he cites, he flattered himself, no doubt, that he might safely have recourse to misrepresentation*.”

The historian is not a little piqued that I should derogate from his industry and labour, in illustrating his fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, with 383 notes. Does he think that their merit is to be estimated by their number alone? Is no attention to be paid to the contents of them? Are we not to consider whether they are sufficient to establish the points for which they are adduced? If all were taken away that are false, and all that are unnecessarily thrown in, to swell them out, it would reduce their formidable bulk; and they would appear naked indeed, as well as loose and general in their reference.

I doubt much whether he has succeeded in his attempt to confute this part of the charge: he has indeed drawn up five reasons to account for the acknowledged nakedness of a few notes; and says, “he is persuaded, that if the examples, in which

* Introduction to Exam. p. 2.

“ he

“ he has occasionally deviated from his ordinary practice, were specified and examined, they might always be fairly attributed to some one of them *.

To this assertion I must give a positive denial; and as this is one instance on which he seems willing “ to stake my credit, and his own, and the merits of our cause, at least, of our characters †,” I shall the more readily appeal to the judgment of the public, with a resolution not to be daunted by severity of language.

My animadversion was directed against the *Quality*, *Contents*, or *Occasion* of his unsupported notes; not the number, quantity, or bulk of them: It did not relate to his *general practice*; but I saw plainly that whenever his inclination led him to extend or contract the sense of an author; whenever he was willing to throw out an insinuation against religion, which would appear more graceful when supported by some testimony; he quoted the author or the book at large, and occasionally laid aside the boasted claim to accuracy and minuteness of distinction. For it is remarkable, though the two chapters are nearly of a size, and the number of the notes not very different, that there should be so many general references in the fifteenth more than there are in the sixteenth chapter. But the reason is obvious; as the former contains the more direct attack on the doctrines and professors of Christianity, he was not compelled to have much recourse to this artful mode in the latter.

I shall not, however, rest satisfied with this general explanation. As Mr. Gibbon insists so much on this matter, “ I will meet him on the hard

* Vind. p. 11, 12, 13, 14.

† Vind. p. 12.

“ ground

“ ground of controversy * ;” and condescend to a minuteness, which might otherwise be neglected, by bringing to view some of the instances of his loose and general references, in order to prove my assertion.

He says, that “ Erasmus removes the difficulty
 “ (of the Millenarian doctrine, and of the ap-
 “ proaching end of the world,) by the help of
 “ allegory and metaphor: and that the learned
 “ Grotius ventures to insinuate that, for wise
 “ purposes, the pious deception was permitted to
 “ take place †. The xxivth chapter of St. Mat-
 “ thew and the 2d epistle of St. Paul to the Thes-
 “ salonians, are cited.” And Mr. Gibbon *now*
 tells us, that “ his reader is guided by the refe-
 “ rence to the proper spot in the commentaries of
 “ Grotius, &c. by the more accurate citation of
 “ the original author; the form of the composi-
 “ tion supplying the want of a local reference ‡.”
 But this reference discovers nothing similar in *Gro-
 tius*, the passage alluded to, (which however does
 not come up to his purpose) being elsewhere, as I
 have shewn in my Examination §: and even in
Erasmus a better reference is necessary, as the only
 words there at all near to his purpose seem not to
 be qualified either by allegory or metaphor ||.

* Vind. p. 67.

† Note 59th, chap. xv. My references answer to the *second*
 edition of Mr. Gibbon's History:

‡ Vind. p. 14.

§ Exam. p. 91.

|| Η γηνα αὐτῶν. Illud obiter annotandum, γῆνα apud
 Græcos aliquoties, non pro ipsa *natione*, seu *gente*, sed pro eo,
 quod Latini nunc *ætatem* vocant, nunc *memoriam*, nonnun-
 quam et *seculum*. Unde Nestor τρεῖς γῆνας vixisse legitur,
 quod tres hominum ætates duraverat. Ad eum modum vide-
 tur hoc accipi loco. *Erasmi*. in *Matt.* xxiv. 39. Ed. fol.
 Lugd. Batav. 1705.

In

In the 65th note, he refers us to the whole works of Sulpicius Severus, (Abauzit giving him no better direction) to find out his complaint, "that the sentence of the council of Laodicea had been ratified by the *greater* number of Christians of his time;" and, without any corroborating testimony, assigns as a reason for the reception of the Apocalypse in the Greek church, that they "were subdued by the authority of an impostor, who, in the sixth century, assumed the character of Dionysius the Areopagite."

In the 68th, he roundly asserts, unsupported by authority, "Whatever may be the language of individuals, yet *the condemnation of the wisest, and most virtuous of the Pagans* is still the public doctrine of all the Christian churches; That, the Jansenists, who have so diligently studied the works of the Fathers, maintain this sentiment with distinguished zeal; and, That the learned M. de Tillemont never dismisses a virtuous Emperor without pronouncing his damnation."

Mr. Gibbon owns that "there are *rare* instances of quotations which he has adopted, expressed with less accuracy than he could have wished *."

I agree with him as to the inaccuracy, but not to their being *rare*. They will surely be best accounted for by throwing the blame on the modern author, whom he transcribed, for not being more minute in his citation, but unfortunately they prove, at the same time, that Mr. G. did not himself consult the original.

At the 69th note he says, in general terms, that "Justin and Clemens of Alexandria allow that some of the philosophers were instructed by the Logos."

* Vind. p. 13.

In the 89th, he quotes the whole volumes of Justin, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustin, "for their opinion as to marriage, and the state of Adam before his fall."

In the 152d, The whole of Abauzit's Discourse on the Apocalypse is cited for the confirmation of a single remark, respecting the Alogians, "who disputed the genuineness of the Apocalypse," &c. But by this general quotation he might hope to conceal his obligation.

In chap. xvi. note 103, Sulpicius Severus is cited at large as being "the first author of the Computation of the ten persecutions."

See also his loose references in chap. xv. notes 8. 14. 22. 31. 32. 61. 71. 79. 85. 98. 102. 103. 124. 135. 139. 142. 149. 155. 168. 177. 180. 193.

Chap. xvi. notes 7. 10. 15.

Had not our author been sensible that this mode of quotation needed some apology, he would not have troubled himself to state five specious reasons to divert the reader from the charge alledged. And though we should admit their validity on some occasions; the *first* of them is at best but a confession of plagiarism; from the *third* he thinks proper to deviate, as we have seen, when it suits his purpose; and the last gives ample liberty to father any opinion on any writer of credit*.

I cannot therefore look upon these fallacious motives as "innocent;" nor, consequently, "as

* See the five reasons stated in the *Vindication*, p. 13, 14. The fifth is, "The idea which I was desirous of communicating to the reader, was sometimes the general result of the author or treatise that I had quoted; nor was it possible to confine, within the narrow limits of a particular reference, the sense or spirit which was mingled with the whole mass."

“ laudable * :” and am of opinion, that if accuracy had not been more regularly practised by other historical writers, they would have small claim to our gratitude or esteem.

Errors of the Press.

I foresaw and anticipated the excuse of which Mr. Gibbon now avails himself; to throw the blame on the corrector of the press.—In some instances this is sufficient †; there will, however, still remain many strong proofs of his inaccuracy and inattention, after we have admitted all his plea. Not but that I am surprised he should rank the mistake of *Idolatria* for *Idololatria* among them, as it often occurs in his history through the several editions. He wishes to persuade his reader, that “ my criticism is never so formidable as when it is directed against the guilty corrector of the press ‡.” Though he would perhaps have felt himself more at ease, had this been true, it is incumbent on me to remind my reader, that I introduced these *inaccuracies* with an apology for the trivial appearance of some of them: and, indeed, I must confess, many of my friends thought me too minute; yet still, though all such be removed, there will remain evident proofs, that had our author consulted the original materials, he would have had more pretensions to his boasted claim of accuracy and diligence.

Out of the *twenty-six* articles of *inaccuracy* which I urged, he has taken no notice of *twelve*; and some of them might call his judgment or his

* Vind. p. 14.

† The instances are, two in Exam. at p. 150; one at p. 153; and one at p. 154.

‡ Vind. p. 16.

learning in question. Such as his quoting one book of Philo for another*—citing the *Benedictine* edition of Chrysostom, when his reference agreed only to the *Savil* edition†—misquoting and extenuating the words of Theodorus Metochita from Valefius's Annotations on Eusebius‡—and, above all, his citing the Theodosian code, lib. 1. tit. 1. 1. 3. for a law contained in the xvith book §.

Now, until he had cleared up this matter, he had little reason to be severe with me, because I hastily quoted the *Theodosian* code for a law contained in the *Justinian* ||: he might have been contented to compromise our mutual inadvertency on this head. Surely an indulgent public will allow a young man to make this plea, when the deeply-read and learned historian condescends to avail himself of the pretext.

For my part, I had been citing the *Theodosian* code, and went from thence to the *Justinian*: and by omitting to alter the title in my papers, I made the mistake. One thing, at least, is manifest, that I *did* turn over the *Justinian*, as well as the *Theodosian* code, and did discover the law to which Mr. G. alluded, without the guidance of his reference, in spite of my ignorance of Roman jurisprudence**. But on the contrary, the Historian of the Roman empire *borrow*s this rescript from the respectable authority of the *modern* Paolo; and is mistaken in quoting the very first title of the first book of the *Theodosian* code.

But another error is alleged against me. In

* Note 127, c. xv. Exam. p. 145.

† Note 157, c. xv.

‡ Note 181, c. xvi. Exam. p. 147, 148.

§ Note 142. c. xvi.

|| Vind. p. 15.

** Exam. p. 230.

transcribing from our Author, I had inaccurately wrote a declaration of *an* old law, instead of *the* old law. I lament my inaccuracy, and ask his pardon. Yet perhaps it is not quite so important as an alteration of the same particle, which he has made in my *Examination*. I had animadverted on his saying, that, “ *In the various compilations of the Augustan history, there are not six lines which relate to the Christians* * ;” and told him, that, “ his false assertion was overthrown by the frequent notice taken of them in *several* passages of that history, which he himself had occasion to cite † .” He now puts an ample concession in my mouth, and makes me own that “ he has occasionally produced *the* several passages of the Augustan history which relate to the Christians ‡ .” The sense of my passage is not a little changed and enlarged by the insertion of the small but emphatic particle. Having perused the compilations of Lardner on this point, I am convinced that the learning of Mr. Gibbon is impeached by the latter as well as the former declaration, in respect to the subject of it. And though *I did not fiercely contend as to the quantity or number of the lines* ; I am afraid his veracity is somewhat interested in the alteration which he has made.

Difference of Editions.

Mr. Gibbon attempts to account for other instances of *misrepresentation*, by imputing them to

* Note 24, c. xvi. Mr. G. seems to have had an eye to the remark of Mr. Moyle, though he has rather enlarged the sense of it.—“ They,” says he (speaking of the Christians) “ are *never once mentioned* with reproach by *Dio*, or the six writers of the *Historia Augusta*.”

“ *Dio*, and the six writers of the *Historia Augusta*, scarce name them at all.” Moyle’s Works, vol. ii. p. 222. 304.

† Exam. p. 83, 84.

‡ Vind. p. 57.

the *difference of editions* *. This excuse will certainly take away some of the *inaccuracies of reference*, with which I charged him † ; and *one* instance of misrepresentation in *Optatus*, which I had urged in an improper sense of the word ‡. But I confess it is the first time I ever knew, that *editors* had the presumption to alter and correct the text of their authors ; to insert, or take away matters of fact. And unless *Dupin* and Bishop *Fell* assumed this strange power, I may venture to assert, that if our Historian did consult the originals, he has amazingly perverted them.

In the instance adduced from *Dupin*, the difference of edition does, indeed, correct the charge of inaccuracy of reference. But what is most important, the *misrepresentation* which I discovered cannot be invalidated by this frivolous excuse. It appears in another page, forcibly condemning his groundless assertion. Mr. G. must allow that I marked out the proper passages alluded to by him in the 8th canon of the council of Ancyra and Neo-cesarea, and the first of Elvira, &c. §. Surely, then, he will no longer say, that the difference of a page will wipe away the stain, and remove all that I advanced against him ||.

Far be it from me to assert that he did not consult *Dupin in the original* ; I supposed him to be so well versed in the *Bibliothèque*, that I ranked its author among those to whom he had particular obligations **. But it is one thing to read a writer,

* Vind. p. 16.

† For instance, one of *Dupin*, Exam. p. 148 ; one of *Optatus*, Exam. p. 151 ; and perhaps those of *Cyprian*.

‡ Exam. p. 73.

§ *Dupin Bibliothèque Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 307. Quarto edit. Paris. 1690.

|| Exam. p. 134.

** Ibid. p. 275.

and

and a very different one to give a fair and impartial account of his words and opinions. He selects *four* instances of particular editions; but for what reason I know not, except, that perhaps those alone afford him any evasion*. I urged the instances of *Cyprian* and *Optatus* more strongly, because I had reason to imagine that I consulted the very same editions as Mr. Gibbon, which I always endeavoured to do, when directed by his reference. That I did so, he is careful not to deny, but only insinuates the contrary; by saying, "Unless I had consulted the same editions, as well as the same places, it would have been extraordinary if I had succeeded†." He would have acted the part of a more generous adversary, if he had stated two out of the four instances, in such a manner that the reader might perceive that we had consulted the same editors, only there was a republication, elsewhere, of the same edition.

Editions consulted

By Mr. GIBBON.

By DAVIS.

Optatus Milevitanus, *Optat. Milev. by Dupin.*
by *Dupin*. fol. Paris. 1700. fol. Antwerp. 1702.

Cypriani Opera. Ed. *Cypriani Opera*, Ed.
Fell. fol. Amsterdam. *Fell.* Oxon. 1682 ‡.
1700.

* One of these is the reference to *Shaw's Travels*, which I had myself thought so trifling as to join it, with three more, in one article (xiii. Exam. p. 151.) and in one of them Mr. G. must be wrong.—But so important is this in his eyes, that it makes a distinguished figure in the list of the four authors, in consulting whom we differed in editions.

† Vind. p. 16.

‡ Mr. G. thus states them :

Mr. GIBBON's Editions.

Mr. DAVIS's Editions.

Optatus Milevitanus, by
Dupin, fol. Paris, 1700.

Fol. Antwerp, 1702.

Cypriani Opera, edit. *Fell.*
fol. Amsterdam, 1700.

Most probably Oxon, 1682.

Mr. G. did not before tell me he meant Fell's edition of Cyprian, published at *Amsterdam*, but, in general terms, *Fell's edition of Cyprian*. If it had not been his design to keep this back from the reader's eye, why should he say, "*most probably Oxon,*" when I had expressly said that I quoted *Fell's Oxford edition* *; and that some of his references agreed therewith.

General Charge of MISREPRESENTATION.

To support this, I have alleged nearly *seventy* instances. How much reason I have to maintain my ground will instantly be seen, by observing, that to *fifty* of these my adversary has made no reply that can possibly be admitted. The remaining number may be reduced under two classes:

1st. Those in which I have been mistaken.

2dly. Those which in substance are just; though erroneous in some circumstances of less importance.

FIRST CLASS.

This will comprise but a few; and in considering the other division, the artifices made use of in the *Vindication* to remove these stubborn difficulties, will appear to my reader to be worthy observation, as they increase and vary almost with every instance.

* Exam. p. 155. I have, in vain, consulted many of the best libraries of Oxford and London for Fell's *Amsterdam* edition of *Cyprian*; but I shall rather give up the instances of inaccuracy, than condescend to accept of Mr. G's illiberal offer of his *servant* "to shew me his library; if I will take the trouble of calling at his house any afternoon when he is *not* at home." *Vind.* p. 91.

PAGE.

PAGI.

I. The instance from *Pagi* must be given up entirely; as I had inaccurately cited Baronius*, without examining the corrections of this Chronologist, which our author has stated †.

MOSHEIM.

II. My assertion that, “ Mr. Gibbon’s reference
 “ to *Mosheim’s* history, does not lead us to discover
 “ the name of Valeria ‡,” was owing to my not
 having read to the end of the section, which happened to be a very long one. But I must still object to Mr. G.’s remark on the occasion: that
 “ Christianity has in every age acknowledged it’s
 “ important obligations to female devotion §.”
 From such a quarter, we could not mistake the sneer; it is of a stamp with what our author elsewhere says; “ After the example of their divine master,
 “ the missionaries of the Gospel addressed themselves to men, and especially to women oppressed by the consciousness, and very often by
 “ the effects of their vices ||: and that the obscure
 “ teachers of Christianity——cautiously avoid the
 “ dangerous encounter of philosophers——and insinuate themselves into those minds, whom their
 “ age, *their sex*, and their education, has the best
 “ disposed to receive the impression of superstitious terrors **.”

* Exam. p. 140.

† Vind. p. 77—80.

‡ Exam. p. 132.

§ Decline and Fall, p. 564.

|| Ibid. p. 480. See also Dr. Watson’s Apology.

** History, p. 514.

But Mr. Gibbon affects to be serious, and pretends that I myself meant to speak slightly of female devotion. Observe what an *honest* artifice he is compelled to adopt, in order to give it an air of probability. He takes away the period at the end of my sentence, and connects my words with his own, leaving only a semicolon; thus: "Christianity has, in every age, acknowledged its important obligations to *female* devotion; the remark is truly *contemptible* *."

The equivocating insinuation of my Adversary, perhaps the happiest he ever hit upon, that "some advocates would disgrace Christianity, if *Christianity could be disgraced*;" at once proves that his manner of defending its cause, indicates no good intention on his part.

His criticism with respect to the word *initata* will surely be admitted by me on the authority of *Bingham* †: I shall therefore retract the charge of *unjustifiable assertion*; and content myself with saying, that Mr. Gibbon differs from Mosheim in his opinion.

OPTATUS.

III. By the difference of editions, the charge relating to a passage in *Optatus* is removed ‡.

* Vind. p. 74. In my Examination it was thus written: (p. 132.) "Much less does the Christian Mosheim give our infidel Historian any pretext for inserting that illiberal malignant insinuation, "*Christianity has, in every age, acknowledged its important obligations to FEMALE devotion.*" The remark is truly *contemptible*."

† Vind. p. 72 — 75.

‡ Exam. p. 73.

TERTULLIAN.

TERTULLIAN. LE CLERC.

IV. and V. The first instance brought from *Tertullian**, and one from *Le Clerc*, must be yielded to his pleading inaccuracy of reference †; but little apology will suffice for mistakes into which I was unavoidably led by giving too much credit to Mr. Gibbon's boasted claim.

MOSHEIM.

VI. His mode of invalidating another instance from *Mosheim*, respecting the progress of the Gospel, is very remarkable. I had confined myself to an assertion in a particular sentence of his history ‡, and had reason to expect that his note was designed to justify it. But the Proteus here escapes me; for, in his *Vindication* ||, he takes in more of his text, produces fresh authority, and, having altered the ground of controversy, is enabled by this reinforcement to repel the attack.

DION CASSIUS.

VII. He tries to evade one instance urged from Dion Cassius, respecting the Jews "discovering a

* Exam. p. 25. Vind. p. 29.

† Ibid. p. 19. Vind. p. 30.

‡ The following was the sentence cited in my Examination: "It will still remain an undoubted fact, that the barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the Roman monarchy, were involved in the darkness of Paganism; and that even the conversion of Iberia, of Armenia, or of Ethiopia, was not attempted with any degree of success, till the scepter was in the hands of an orthodox emperor." Gibbon's Hist. p. 512. Exam. p. 126, 127.

|| Vind. p. 66.

" fierce

“ fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome,” by asserting that “ his citation related only to the “ note*.” If this plea be allowed, we must acquit him. But is it not an odd way, to bring a note, which any one would think was meant to confirm the text, whilst the authority cited relates only to the contents of the note? The former, therefore, remains still to be proved: and if this was the intent of adding notes to his two chapters, it is to little purpose that he boasts of “ illustrating “ them with three hundred and eighty-three “ notes.”

VIII. The other from Dion is attempted to be removed by a combination of two notes. In the one which I censured, he had said, “ Nor has the “ diligence of Xiphilin discovered the name of “ Christians in the large history of Dion Cassius†.” With this alone I was concerned; but Mr. G. having added in a different note, that “ *it was* “ *Dion Cassius, or rather his abbreviator, Xiphilin‡;*” he avails himself of the equivocation. It is at best a point in debate whether the passage in which the name of *Christians* appears, is Dion’s; but as he produces the authority of *Lardner*, for supposing it to be the insertion of *Xiphilin* §, I shall not be peremptory in this charge; only let it be remembered, that *Lardner* himself allows that “ the “ sense may be *Dion’s* ||.”

* Vind. p. 54. Exam. p. 11.

† Note 24, c. xvi. Exam. p. 83.

‡ Note 106. c. xvi.

§ Vind. p. 55—57.

|| His words are, “ However the sense may be Dion’s. “ But I wish, we had also his stile, without any adulteration.” &c. *Heathen Testimonies. On Dion Cassius*, vol. iii. p. 58.

SECOND

SECOND CLASS.

The instances produced under the first class, I have admitted as errors, though they chiefly arose from our author's inaccuracy; yet under this head, whatever arts he may have used to mislead the reader's attention, the following instances will prove that I have supported the main intent for which they were advanced.

TERTULLIAN.

I. By the artful connection of *Tertullian's* expression, "*Qui primus hic gladium in nos egit,*" with the account of the Scyllitan martyrs from *Ruinart*; Mr. Gibbon has endeavoured to destroy another charge of misquoting that Father*. Should we allow this combination to be just, and a sufficient proof that "*martyrdoms* were lately introduced into *Africa*;" yet our Author's assertion was, that "we cannot discover any assured traces of *faith* as well as *persecution*†." Can He deny, that the establishment and progress of Christianity, previous to that period, is vouched by *Tertullian*? and must not *faith*, in the nature of things, have preceded *persecution*? I had allowed that other authors cited by Mr. Gibbon countenance his opinion, that *it was late before the Roman missionaries passed either the sea or the Alps*;" &c. and my censure was confined to his crowding in *Tertullian* among them. But we shall hereafter see that this strange connection of authorities is a new mode invented by our Historian of confirming historical facts.

* Vind. p. 32.

† History, l. xv. p. 510. Exam. p. 35, 36.

PRUDENTIUS.

PRUDENTIUS.

II. In the instance from *Prudentius*, cited by me only as an *Inaccuracy*, and ranked in that class, I expressed my surprise, that Mr. Gibbon should single out that particular line; “Nec minus involat terris, nec ab hoc recedit orbe:” and allowed that Cyprian was spoken of in the hymn, as a great teacher*. Therefore, before Mr. G. lengthened the quotation, my censure was justifiable†.

JEROME.

III. In the passage from *Jerome* I undoubtedly inserted the Greek translation of the Latin words “*de magistrum* ‡.” But how does it appear from thence that I had quoted them as the *original words of Cyprian*? I must therefore beg some better proof than Mr. Gibbon’s bare assertion, that I was guilty of this *ridiculous pedantry* §.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

IV. In the class of those instances, in which though I have been mistaken in some points, the force of my argument still prevails; is the following one from *Justin Martyr*.

Our Historian had asserted, “that a modern inquisitor would hear with surprise, that whenever an information was given to a Roman magistrate, of any person within his jurisdiction who had embraced the sect of the Christians, the charge was committed to the party accused,

* Exam. p. 144, 145.

‡ Exam. p. 145.

† Vind. p. 34.

§ Vind. p. 33.

“ and

“ and that a convenient time was allowed him
 “ to settle his domestic concerns, and to prepare
 “ an answer to the crime that was imputed to
 “ him *.”

He appeals to “ the second apology of Justin
 “ for a particular and very curious instance of this
 “ legal delay †.” I affirmed in my Examination ‡, that “ the following instance is the only
 “ one that bears the most distant similitude.” So
 far I was in the right: but in stating the fact I
 had not given it its full force. For though I now
 see that in the case of the woman herself, she
 sued for this delay, and it was granted her: (I
 trust the candour of the public will credit my so-
 lemn declaration that the omission of the circum-
 stance was the consequence of undue precipita-
 tion alone:) yet the case itself proves nothing to
 the general practice. For it is plain from this
 very place in Justin, “ that *Ptolemy* had no time in-
 “ dulged him; he was only asked *whether he was a*
 “ *Christian?* and on his confession, was ordered for
 “ punishment §. And one named *Lucius*, also, re-
 “ proving the judge (*Urbicus*) for the unjust sen-
 “ tence pronounced on a person guilty of no other
 “ crime but that of *being called a Christian*, was
 “ ordered for execution; the judge only replying,
 “ and you also appear to be one of that sect: and a
 “ third was condemned in the same manner **.”

It

* Hist. p. 553.

† Note 98. c. xvi.

‡ Exam. p. 71.

§ See the Examination, p. 72.

** Καὶ τὸ Οὐρβικὸν κελυσσάντος αὐτὸν ΑΠΙΧΘΗΝΑΙ, Λουκιὸς τις,
 καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς Χριστιανὸς, ὄρων τὴν ἀλογίαν ὥτως γενομένην κρείσιν, πρὸς
 τοῦ Οὐρβικίου εἶπεν, τίς ἡ αἰτία τὴν μητὲ μοιχοῦ ————— μητὲ ἀρπαγῆ,
 μητὲ ἀπλῶς ἀδικήματι τι πράξαντα ἐλεγχόμενον, ὀνόματος δὲ Χρι-
 στιανὸς προσωνυμίαν ὁμολογῶντα τὸν ἀνδρωπῶν τῶτον ἐκόλμισεν; —————
 καὶ ὅς, εἶδεν ἄλλο ἀποκρινάμενος, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Λαρκίον εἶπεν, δοκεῖς μοι
 καὶ σὺ εἶναι τοιοῦτος. καὶ τὸ Λαρκίον φησάντος, Μαλιστα, παλιν καὶ
 αὐτὸν

It shews great ingenuity in Mr. Gibbon, so opportunely to introduce this pompous description of the *mildness* of the Roman magistrates, that he might confirm it by a *curious instance of legal delay*; selected from an apology of Justin, in which he states the case of three martyrs to whom *no* delay was granted; and expresses his own imminent danger of meeting the same treatment from the *humane* magistrate Crescens *.

IGNATIUS.

V. Unfortunately, in my *Examination*, I asserted too peremptorily, that there was no passage in the epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrneans, which bore the least affinity to our Historian's assertion, that "the Father employed a vague and doubtful tradition, instead of quoting the certain testimony of the Evangelists †."

Mr. Gibbon here triumphs over my ignorance and inadvertency ‡; but the passage which escaped my notice was pointed out by Dr. Chelsum §, before the *Vindication* was published. I easily perceived the intent of Mr. Gibbon in introducing the remark; though, having used a different edition of Ignatius, I could not discover the passage; which

αὐτοὺς ΑΠΑΧΘΗΝΑΙ ἐκέλευσεν.—ἄλλος δὲ τρίτος ἐπιλθὼν, κολασθῆναι προσετιμῆθη Justin Martyr, Apolog. secunda, p. 90. ed. Benedic. 1742.

It is remarkable, that ἀπαχθῆναι is the very word used by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles (c. xii. 19.) when he relates Herod's command, that the soldiers who were appointed to guard St. Peter, when the angel delivered him out of prison, *should be put to death*.

* Καὶ γὰρ ἐν προσδοκῇ ὑπὸ τινος τῶν νομομασιῶν ἐπιβιβασθῆναι, καὶ ζυγῷ ἐμπαρῆναι. Apolog. ii. § 3.

† Hist. note 34. c. xv. Exam. p. 100.

‡ Vind. p. 60—63.

§ Remarks, p. 42—48. second edit.

is however, far from being very clear. And I might perhaps assert, with some degree of probability, that he did not himself discover from the *original words* of Ignatius, that the Father *intended* to *employ a vague and doubtful tradition*; but having first met with the observation, was guided by the learning of others to the passage in the epistle which occasioned it. For in his *Vindication* he goes through a series of arguments, adopted by his modern assistants, before he comes to the conclusion drawn from it in his history. But if the passage was too deep for my penetration, our Historian has made but an indifferent use of it when he discovered it. For I now have before me the very edition he quotes, and am astonished to find that he should give us an interpretation so wide from the sense of the original.

The words are Εγω γαρ και μετα αναστασιν εν σαρκι αυτον οίδα, και πιστευω οντα. κ. τ. λ. Thus translated by Cotelerius: "Ego enim & post resurrectionem onem eum in carne novi, & credo esse *."

Mr. Gibbon might have learnt from his judicious opponent Dr. Chelsum, that the learned Lardner thus renders the passage †: "But I know that after the resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe him to be so still." Archbishop Wake also translates it thus: "But I know that *even* after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is still so ‡." Yet Mr. Gibbon has thought proper to translate it—"I have known, and I believe, that after his resurrection likewise *he existed* in the flesh §."

* Ep. ad Smyrn. Patr. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 34. ed. Coteler. Clericus. 1724.

† Remarks, p. 44, 45, second edition.

‡ Wake's Genuine Epistles of the Fathers, p. 115. 8vo ed.

§ Vind. p. 61.

Am

Am I to suppose him ignorant of the Greek and Latin languages? or, does he wilfully misinterpret, and alter the punctuation of the sentence *? Does he not know that οἶδα, though a perfect tense, has a *present* signification; as well as *novi*? And that οὐτα is a *present* participle, and can by no means be translated *existed*: surely no scholar would render it in a past tense.

Let us now pass on from this false or ignorant translation to the matter in dispute, whether “ Ignatius employed a *vague and doubtful tradition*, “ instead of quoting the certain testimony of the “ Evangelists † ?” This point having been discussed by Dr. Chelsum, who had accurately collected the various opinions of the learned respecting it; it is surprising Mr. Gibbon should again insist on the matter; especially as the Doctor, shewing himself the fair advocate of truth, has even put into his hands most of the arguments by which he now defends himself.

But as Mr. Gibbon says, “ he embraces the “ rational sentiment of *Causabon* and *Pearson* ‡;” and quotes *some* of their words, it will be necessary to tell the reader what *they* mean by the phrase “ *unwritten tradition* :” for Mr. G. is not always free from “ the bad habit,” with which he charges me, “ of greedily snapping at the first words of a reference, without giving himself the trouble of “ going to the end of the page or paragraph §.”

The sentence quoted by our author is to be found in *Pearson*, as the opinion of *Causabon*, ap-

* Mr. G. thus points the sentence—Εγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀποστολῆς ἐν σκεπῇ αὐτοῦ οἶδα καὶ πείθω οὐτα, καὶ οὔτε κ. τ. λ. carrying on the sense through the whole passage.

† Hist. note 34. c. xv.

‡ Vind. p. 63.

§ Ibid. p. 74.

proved of by the Bishop. “ Præterea iterum ob-
 “ servandum est, quod de hac re scripsit Isaacus
 “ Causabonus, *Quinetiam fortasse verius, non ex*
 “ *Evangelio Hebraico, Ignatium illa verba descrip-*
 “ *sisse, verum traditionem allegasse non scriptam, quæ*
 “ *postea in literas fuerit relata, et Hebraico Evan-*
 “ *gelio, quod Matthæo tribuebant, inserta. Et hoc*
 “ *quidem mihi multo verisimilius videtur :*” But
 it should be observed, that the Bishop afterwards
 explains his meaning, thus: “ Multa sane Christi
 “ dicta in ore vetustissimorum Christianorum fue-
 “ runt, quæ in Evangeliiis nostris non reperiuntur,
 “ neque in aliis ullis fortasse unquam scripta sunt.
 “ — *Quidni pariter & S. Ignatius, qui, cum Apostolis*
 “ *& eorum discipulis versatus est, præsertim eo tem-*
 “ *pore quo scriptis Evangeliiis uti fortè ei jam victo*
 “ *non licebat, eandem historiam, quam narrat S.*
 “ *Lucas, aliis verbis explicaret * ?*”

I shall therefore repeat to Mr. Gibbon, that so
 far is Bishop Pearson from considering these words
 as a *vague and doubtful tradition*, or *taken out of*
the spurious Hebrew gospel, that it is his opinion,
Ignatius alludes to and intended to quote the certain
testimony of the Evangelist: that is, he related
 in different words the same part of history recorded
 by St. Luke, but being in prison, and probably
 not having the Gospels before him, he could not
 cite them otherwise than by memory.

It also seems strange that he should as-
 sert in his *Vindication*, that “ neither of the
 “ Gospels of St. Luke and St. John contain the
 “ characteristic words *εν δαιμονιον σωματος*, and
 “ the important circumstance that either Peter, or
 “ those who were with Peter, touched the body

* Pearson *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, part ii. c. ix. p. 396, in
 tom. ii. *Patr. Apostol.* ed. Coteler. Clericus. 1724.

“ of Christ, and believed *.” For Dr. Chelsum had quoted the authority of learned men to corroborate the opinion, that the words were synonymous, and cited the verses of the Gospel *where words exactly of the same import occur*: “ Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. *Handle me and see*, for a spirit has not flesh and bones, as ye see me have †.”

It is to be feared that our Historian has not paid a proper attention to the contents of the sacred volume in general, as well as to this passage in particular. But when the analogy was pointed out, he ought not to have repeated an objection which had been confuted.

I shall only add, that this is another proof how stale the objections are which Mr. Gibbon repeats against the Fathers. This was made long since by *Daillé*: to him he was probably indebted for the first thought of it; which we may the more reasonably suppose, as I have shewn in my *Examination*, his obligations to that writer on other points.

Bp. Pearson charges *Daillé* himself with purloining the objection from Jerom ‡: and I am persuaded the reader will be convinced, by a bare comparison of my note annexed, how much our Author is indebted to him ||.

CLEMENS.

* Vind. p. 62.

† Remarks, p. 45. Luke. c. xxiv. 39.

Ἰδετε τὰς χεῖρας μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι αὐτός εἰμι·
 ΠΗΛΑΦΗΣΑΤΕ ΜΕ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΕΤΕ ὅτι πνεῦμα σὰρκα καὶ ὅσα ἐκ
 ἐχέει καθὼς ἐμε θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα—ἐπεδείξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ
 τοὺς πόδας. The words of Ignatius are perfectly similar:
 Πυλαφῆσατε με, καὶ ἰδετε κ. τ. λ.

‡ Pearson, Vind. Ignat. in loc. ante cit.

|| “Sunt etiam in epistolis nonnulla, quæ licet rectam fidem non pubeant, aliena tamen videntur vel ab ea reverentia, quæ divinis libris debetur, vel a pietate, vel a veracitate, qua

CLEMENS.

VI. That I am authorised by learned men to insist on the propriety of calling Clemens *bishop of Rome* from this epistle, without entering into the well known controversy of the difference between the words *Episcopus* or *Bishop*, and *Presbyter*; will appear from Archbishop Wake's genuine *Epistles of the Fathers*.

He says, "Eusebius, Epiphanius, and St. Hierome expressly tell us, that the *Clement* meant by St. Paul was the same that was afterwards *Bishop*

qua hominem Christianum, præsertim vero episcopum, decet. Quale est, quod ex apochryphis quædam furatur, eaque pro veris ac indubitatis ponit; quasi apochryphorum fides certa sit.——

Noster ille epistolicus *Ignatius Dominice* carnis veritatem adversus hæreticos *confirmans*, verba quædam veluti Christi, sic recitat: *Και ὅτε πρὸς τὰς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Λαβετε, ψυχαφθεσάτε με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ δαίμονιον ἀσωμάτων.* (Ign. ad Smyrn. ed. vetust. Usser. p. 219.)—Jam illam Domini *ῥησιν*, "*Non sum demonium incorporeum*:" unde hic scriptor sumpserit, nescire se fatetur Eusebius. (Hist. l. iii. c. 36.)—Hieronymus vero docet unde eam descripserit, "*ex Evangelio* (inquit in lib. de Script. Eccles. in Ignat.) "*quod nuper a me translatus est*;" & alibi diserte testatur, id *Evangelium*, ex quo hæc desumpta sunt, *Hebræum* esse, a *Nazaræis hereticis* olim lectitatum. Id autem evangelium falsum & apochryphum fuisse, & omnes consentiunt, & universæ ecclesiæ fides probat:—Nunc ergo quæro, cur his noster *Ignatius Christi verba*, *veritatis fontes fastidians*, *ex impuris apochryphorum lacunis ficta*, *quam vera ex certis, ac divinitus inspiratis libris apud Smyrnæos promovere maluerit?*" &c. (Dallæus de libris suppositis Ignat. cap. 17, p. 338, 399, 4^o ed. Genevæ, 1666.)

We cannot deny that Mr. Gibbon has looked over the arguments of the Bishop urged to confute his friend Daillé; (and from them he might perhaps learn, that *Jerom* mentions a copy of this Hebrew Gospel, which was extant in the library at *Cæsarea*;) though he has not thought proper to state his conclusions.

of *Rome* * :” &c. “ But, continues he, whatever he was, or wherever he laboured before, in this I think antiquity is absolutely agreed, that he at last came to be *Bishop of Rome*; and was placed in that See by the express direction of one, or both the apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul †.”

If it be granted that St. *Clement* was not Bishop at the time he wrote this epistle, as some assert; yet this will not prove there were no traces of episcopacy. For though *Wake* observes, that “ St. Clement wrote not this Epistle in his own name, but in the name of the *whole Church of Rome*, to the *Corinthians* ‡ :” yet he does not draw the inference which Mr. Gibbon insists upon from this circumstance; but says, “ I conclude then that this Epistle was written shortly after the persecution under Nero §, between the 64th and 70th year of Christ. And that, as the learned defender of this period supposes, in the vacancy of the *See of Rome*, before the promotion of St. Clement to the government of it. But of this last circumstance, as there is no certainty, so the express authority of Tertullian ||, that St. Clement was made *Bishop of Rome* by St. Peter; and this delivered as

* Discourse concerning the several Treatises: ch. ii. of St. Clement's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 6. § 4.

I shall beg leave here to follow Mr. G.'s method of making a figure with the authorities cited by the learned author whom I follow.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. iii. c. 12. (c. 16, ed. Reading) Epiph. lib. i. adv. Carpocrat. n. 6. Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. et Comm. in loc. (Esaïam, c. 52, &c.) Item. lib. i. adv. Jovin. Photii Cod. Tem. 113, &c.

† Discourse, &c. ch. ii. sect. 7.

‡ Sect. i. 14, 15.

§ Dodwel. Append. ad cap. vi. Dissert. 2. Cave Hist. Literar. in Clement. p. 18. Compare Dr. Grabe Spicileg. tom. i. p. 255, &c.

|| De Præscript. adv. Hæres. cap. 32.

“ the tradition of the Roman Church in the days
 “ that he lived, has inclined * others rather to
 “ think that he must have been *Bishop* of that
 “ *Church* when he wrote this Epistle ; though neither
 “ can this be affirmed as certain and indubitable †.”

That I have put no unusual interpretation on the word *Επισκοπος* in my *Examination* ‡, appears from the translation by this learned prelate.

“ The Apostles have preached to us from our
 “ Lord Jesus Christ : Jesus Christ from God.
 “ Christ, therefore, was sent by God ; the Apo-
 “ stles by Christ : so both were orderly sent ac-
 “ cording to the will of God. For having re-
 “ ceived their command,—they went abroad—
 “ Thus preaching through countries and cities,
 “ they appointed the first fruits of *their conversions*
 “ to be *bishops and ministers* over such as should
 “ afterwards believe, having first proved them by
 “ the spirit :” &c. §. And again,

“ So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord
 “ Christ, that there should contentions arise upon
 “ the account of *the ministry* :” which word is ren-
 “ dered more literally in the margin ; “ *about the*
 “ *name of the bishopric.*”

I must therefore conclude, that *there are traces of an episcopal order in the Epistle of Clement* : nor will Mr. G.’s evasive construction of the word *Bishop*,

* See Dr. Grabe loc. cit. p. 259.

† Sect. 16, p. 12.

‡ Exam. p. 44, 45.

§ St. Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians, sect. 42. Vide Cotelier. in loc. This refers us to a passage in Cotelierius, which authorizes my interpretation.—“ Hic insurgunt adversus Ecclesiam novi Aëriani, clamantes agnosci dumtaxat à Clemente duos in Clero ordines, Episcoporum eorumdemque Presbyterorum, & Diaconorum. Ad quos breviter respondeo.” &c. See note p. 171, 172. ed. fol. 1724. See also his *Testimonies of the Ancients* respecting Clemens, p. 128

confounding it with *Presbyter*, even admitting it to be just, give him more of the argument than I shall still have in my favour.

LACTANTIUS.

VII. My adversary has prudently selected *one* out of the three instances of misrepresentation, which I had produced from Lactantius *; but he is most unfortunately involved in fresh difficulties, by attempting to extricate himself from the former. I was certainly too hasty, in saying that he asserts the facts on the *sole* authority of Lactantius. The reader who turns to my *Examination* will see, that it was not my design to deny that the Christians received favour from Diocletian, but to censure Mr. G. for appealing to Lactantius on this occasion. For the reference made to this Father, as our author himself now confesses, expressly pointed out *the exception* to the free exercise of the Christian religion; which in his History he tells us was “enjoyed by the eunuchs, and other officers of the palace, with their wives and children †.” Therefore all that he says in his *Vindication* is unnecessary.

With regard to the second point; “the testimony on which the proof of their toleration was built;” I can hardly be stiled *disingenuous* for concealing it, because it was in fact a passage of which I was ignorant. Mr. G. having only quoted the *Spicilegium* at large, I despaired to discover the *instruction of Theonas*, as the work of *d'Acheron* runs thro' fifteen thick quarto volumes; and it afforded me one ground for my complaint of his

* Exam. p. 75—81.

† Vind. p. 53. Hist. p. 564.

loose references. But having now by the guidance of *Tillemont* found out the ancient and curious instruction, I shall state the matter fully to my reader.

That the Christians were in a better state in the earlier part of Diocletian's reign, especially in the East, than they had been for many years before, is an incontestible fact. All history confirms it. They suffered however even now very grievously in the West. The letter of Theonas to Lucian is indeed a very curious piece of antiquity. *Tillemont* has given us a fair representation of it; to him Mr. G. refers us; *on whose faith*, he says, *he was contented with quoting it, as he had not the opportunity of quoting the original*: yet Mr. Gibbon has set his own mark.—Theonas, speaking of Diocletian, says, “The Emperor himself, having not yet embraced the Christian religion, entrusted his life and his person to the care of Christians, as to *more faithful men* *.” *Tillemont* thus translates it: “The Prince whom Lucian served was of opinion, that he and his companions would be *more faithful than others, because they were Christians*; so that he intrusted them with the care of his person, and even of his life †.” Mr. G. states the matter thus:—“Diocletian and his colleagues frequently conferred the most important offices on those persons who avowed their abhorrence for the worship of the Gods,”

* “Ipse Princeps nondum Christianæ Religioni ascriptus, ipsis Christianis velut fidelioribus vitam et corpus suum curandum credidit. Spicilegium, tom. xii. p. 546.

† Celui sous qui servoit Lucien crut que lui & ses compagnons seroient plus fideles que d'autres, parcequ'ils étoient Chrétiens; de sorte qu'il leur confia le soin de sa personne, & de sa vie même. *Memoires Ecclesiast.* tom. v. part 1. p. 11, 12.

“ but *who had displayed abilities proper for the service of the state* *.”

Though Mr. Gibbon has passed over this most material circumstance, as not suiting his purpose, he has closely translated Tillemont in the other matters.

“ *Prisca sa femme, & Valerie sa fille, femme de Maximin Galere, peuvent bien avoir contribué à le rendre favorable aux Chrétiens.*”

—Lactance (pers. c. 15.) nous fait aussi juger, ou plutôt nous assure, que les plus puissans des eunuques qui regloient tout dans son palais estoient Chrétiens, & assez genereux pour souffrir même le martyre. La suite nous le fera voir; notamment de *S. Dorothee*, de *S. Pierre*, & de *S. Gorgone*. — Une fort belle instruction dressée par l'évesque Theonas (pour Lucien grand chambellan) nous apprend encor que *Lucien qui estoit fort considéré de son Prince, avoit converti beaucoup d'officiers du palais, comme ceux qui avoient la garde* des

“ But the leisure of the two Empresses, of his wife *Prisca*, and of *Valeria* his daughter, permitted them to listen with more attention and respect to the truths of Christianity, which in every age has acknowledged it's important obligations to female devotion. The principal eunuchs *Lucian and Dorotheus, Gorgonius and Andrew*, who attended the person, possessed the favour, and governed the household of *Diocletian*, protected by their powerful influence the faith which they had embraced. *Their example was imitated by many of the most considerable officers of the palace, who in their respective stations had the care of the imperial ornaments, of the robes,* of

• History, p. 564.

des ornemens imperiaux, des pierreries, des habits, des autres meubles de l'empereur, & mesme de son tresor particulier. Et au lieu que d'autres Princes avoient regardé les Chrétiens comme des gens dangereux, & fouillez de toutes sortes des crimes, (*maleficos*) celui sous qui servoit Lucien crut que luy & ses compagnons seroient plus fideles que d'autres parce qu'ils estoient Chrétiens; de sorte qu'il leur confia le soin de sa personne & de sa vie mesme *.

of the furniture, of the jewels, and even of the private treasury. (Lactantius de M. P. c. 15.) —Diocletian and his colleagues frequently conferred the most important offices on those persons who avowed their abhorrence for the worship of the Gods, but *who had displayed abilities proper for the service of the state* †. "Tillemont has quoted—a very curious instruction which Bp. Theonas composed for the use of Lucian ‡."

Can there be a more evident proof of his wilful mutilation, misrepresentation, and plagiarism? he inserts or leaves out, at his pleasure, the account of the author whom he pretends to follow faithfully.

We also see, as Tillemont's memoirs lay open before him, they suggested to him the order which he follows in his history.

La profonde paix & la liberté tout entiere dont on jouissoit depuis quelque

"The corruption of manners and principles so forcibly pointed

* Tillemont, *ibid.*

† Hist. p. 564.

‡ C. xvi. n. 132.

quelque temps, nous fit “ ed out by Eusebius,”
tomber, dit Eusebe (l. viii. &c. l. viii. c. 1. & 2.
c. 1.) dans le relasche-
ment & dans la Pareffe,
&c.

Could any thing but the most determined intention at every turn to depreciate Christianity, have led to so artful a misrepresentation? This is a specimen of that rule for making *a consistent and interesting narrative, from authorities, where the authors referred to are not to be expected to vouch for all that is said* *.

Let me put one question to Mr. G. further. Why did he not give us in his note the *particular* reference to the Spicilegium which Tillemont points out? will he call this *one of those rare instances, which he has never attempted to conceal, wherein he has been obliged to adopt quotations which were expressed with less accuracy than he could have wished*? No; it is plain he has attempted to conceal it: and the reason is obvious. He was afraid that the reader might follow him, and trace his disingenuity of conduct. This is a strong proof that our Historian has undertaken to support a bad cause by means equally culpable. It is with reason his anonymous opponent has applied the censure of the poet to him:

“ *Causa patrocinio non bona pejor erit* †.”

I cannot dismiss this Father, without remarking the different character which Mr. Gibbon, not without the greatest inconsistency, gives us of his writings.

He generally meets with abuse from our faith-

* Vind. p. 59.

† See an excellent and pointed reply to Mr. Gibbon, intitled, *A short Appeal to the Public, &c.*

ful

ful Historian : who says, the authority of Lactantius is *very doubtful* ; and that he states facts in a manner that *best suits his purpose* *.

Yet elsewhere he condescends to honor the testimony of Lactantius as well as that of Eusebius, speaking of them as much more to be relied on than the younger Victor † : and ranks them among *unexceptionable authorities* ‡. It appears therefore, that Mr. Gibbon can quote the authority of the Fathers, and speak highly of them, when their relations *suit his hypothesis*.

EUSEBIUS.

VIII. In retorting the charges of misrepresentation with respect to this author, Mr. Gibbon

• Our author says, after citing Lactantius (de Mort. Persecut. c. 18.) “ Were the particulars of this conference more consistent with truth and decency, we might still ask, how they came to the knowledge of an obscure rhetorician ? But there are many historians who put us in mind of the admirable saying of the great Condé to Cardinal de Retz ; “ *Ces coquins nous font parler et agir, comme ils auroient fait eux-mêmes à notre place.* ” Note 7. c. xiv. See also note 4. c. xiv. note 107. c. xiii. note 167. c. xvi. &c.

† Note 153. c. xiii.

‡ Note 18. c. xiv.

It can hardly be accidental that our author and Mr. Moyle should again use the very same words in speaking of Lactantius. “ Not even Lactantius makes Commodus a persecutor, though he died a violent death, which *would have suited very well with his hypothesis*. And it is for no other reason but the want of this single circumstance, that he has struck Trajan, the Antonini, and Severus, out of the list of the persecutors, though they were all notoriously so.” Works, Vol. ii. p. 264.

Mr. Gibbon says,—“ As Maxentius was vanquished by Constantine, it *suits the purpose of Lactantius* to place his death among those of the persecutors.” Note 167. c. xvi.

most emphatically says ; “ Some of the charges
 “ of Mr. Davis on this head are so strong, so
 “ pointed, so vehemently urged, that he seems
 “ to have staked, on the event of the trial, the
 “ merits of our respective characters. If his as-
 “ sertions are true, I deserve the contempt of the
 “ learned, and the abhorrence of good men. If
 “ they are false, ***** ||.”

I accept the challenge, and am now ready to assert the justice of my censure, where it is supported by facts, and at the same time to acknowledge those mistakes which I committed in stating them.

I shall begin with the second instance urged by Mr. G. as therein I have unfortunately mistaken Eusebius, and attributed to *Maxentius* what is spoken of *Maximin*, concerning *magic and superior cruelty*, not making a proper distinction, as he says, “ to whom the second member of the
 “ period belonged *.” Notwithstanding, it is still evident that Eusebius represents *Maxentius*, as well as Maximin, as a persecutor. He says, that he set out with a pretended favour to them for interested reasons.—“ Maxentius at first made
 “ a false shew (καθυπεκρίνατο) of being a Christian,
 “ to gain the favour of the Romans, and there-
 “ fore gave orders to those under his command, to
 “ cease from persecuting the Christians ; *hypocri-*
 “ *tically affecting* to be actuated by religion, in
 “ order to appear to be much more favourable
 “ and mild than his predecessors. But he did
 “ not afterwards act as had been expected from
 “ such a beginning ;” and adds, that he was joined

! Vind. p. 41.

* Vind. p. 45. Exam. p. 64.

in a private confederacy with Maximin*. The very title of the chapter, "*on the conduct of the enemies of religion*" (Περὶ τῆς τροπῆς τῶν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐχθρῶν) proves that Mr. G. must assert, that "*it suited the purpose of Eusebius, as well as Lactantius, to rank Maxentius among the persecutors* †.

But give me leave to recal to my reader's mind (who may not perhaps have my *Examination* and Mr. Gibbon's *History* before him at the same time) the occasion for which our Historian first cited this chapter of Eusebius. It was to confirm his assertion, that "*Maxentius, who oppressed every other class of his subjects, shewed himself just, humane, and even partial towards the afflicted Christians* ‡." Now even granting that the *Christians* only suffered in their civil capacity in the massacre here related by Eusebius, as Mr. G. would have us understand §; we have at best only proofs of the *negative* favor towards them, of his desisting from persecuting them. Nor was this favor long continued; for in this same chapter of Eusebius, we read of the affinity and similarity of the crimes of *Maxentius* to those of *Maximin*; with whom he is called, *a brother in wickedness* ||. The Historian enlarges on a signal example of the cruelty of each of them to two *Christian* women, who refused to submit to their adulterous solicitations **; and expressly attributes the cause of the

* Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. l. viii. c. 14.

See the passage cited, *Examination*, p. 65.

† History, note 167. c. xvi. Exam. p. 64.

‡ History, p. 577.

§ Vind. p. 45.

|| Ὁ δὲ τυραννὸς Μαξιμίνος, ὡς ἀνὰ πρὸς ἀδελφὸν τὴν κακίαν πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ Ρωμῆς Φιλίαν κρυβδὸν σπεινόμενος κ. τ. λ.

** This fact is mentioned by our author, c. xiv. p. 420. and note 45;

numerous

numerous evils and calamities which the distressed people suffered from the two Emperors, to the *persecution raised against the Christians*; which “*confusions and commotions, he says, did not cease till toleration was granted to them*†.” I have proved therefore, to give our author his phrase back again, “*from the evidence of words and facts, the plain meaning of Eusebius without the concurring testimony of Cæcilius or Lactantius, who (it is agreed on both sides) places the death of Maxentius amongst those of the persecutors;*” that Maxentius did not shew himself *just, nor humane, much less partial towards the afflicted Christians.*

These are all the instances wherein I have been mistaken either *materially, or in less important circumstances.*

I come now to the next division, in which I see no reason, at present, for giving up the smallest point, however disputed by Mr. G. ; and in discharging this, I shall have occasion to shew, that our author has had recourse in his *Vindication* to fresh instances of misrepresentation, in order to clear himself from those before charged on him.

† Τοσαυτη δὴ κακίᾳ φορὰ ἵφ' ἑα καὶ τοὶ αὐτοὶ συνεχθῆναι κείρον, πρὸς τῶν δύο τυραννῶν ἀνατολῇ καὶ δυσὶ διιληφῶτων κατεργασθῆναι. τίς δ' αὖ τὴν τοσούτων διερευνημένος αἰτίας διζαξαι, μὴ ἔχοντων ΚΑΘ' ἩΜΩΝ ΔΙΩΓΜΩΝ ἀποφθῆναι. ὅτι γὰρ μάλιστ' αὖ πρότερον τὰ τῆς τοσούτου πεπαιγμένου συγχύσεως, ἢ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΥΣ τὰ τῆς παρρησίας ἀπολαβεῖν. Hist. Eccles. l. viii. c. 14.

THIRD

T H I R D C L A S S .

Several of the artifices, made use of by our historian, to evade the accusation alleged by me, have already been taken notice of: I come now to some other classes, which are ranked under this head, because I cannot allow the validity of his plea.

And, in order to prevent for the future, my improperly applying the word MISREPRESENTATION, which (as Mr. G. complains) has been once or twice used in too general a sense: I shall keep before my eyes an instance that Dr. Johnson produces of its import, in his dictionary, from *Atterbury*; which is,

“ Since I have shewn him his foul mistakes and
“ injurious *Misrepresentations*, it would become
“ him publickly to own and retract them.”

III. He says, that I support one class of Misrepresentations, by making him answerable for the circumjacent errors and inconsistencies of the authors whom he quotes. *Justin*, *Diodorus Siculus*, and *Tacitus* are the instances he produces *. But as their testimony was made the criterion by which he was condemned †; I shall set these three down as charges which he could not disprove.

X. By dogmatical assertion, he hopes to evade other accusations. In the number of these are several instances brought from Mosheim; among which he makes most decisive work, and would set aside six of them without offering any refutation; and bestows only a few words, little to the purpose, on a seventh. But till he gives a better reason for his silence than by saying, that “ the

* Vind. p. 60.

† Exam. p. 5, 9, 10.

“ superfluous

“superfluous observations he could make on these questions would be an abuse of his reader’s time, and his own *;” I shall consider these as *seven* more instances to which he can give no satisfactory answer.

XI. The passage of *Irenæus* respecting *the gift of tongues*, urged by me †, as well as by Doctor Chelsum ‡, meets only the feeble attack of positive denial unsupported by authority. With reason he says, “the truth of the matter was thoroughly sifted in the controversy about the duration of miracles §;” but he must not be offended if I give a new turn to his phrase, and assert that the works of Dr. *Middleton’s Adversaries* still remain, to confute the fallacious argument drawn from the words of *Irenæus*. The validity therefore of this instance, as the *eleventh* charge not disproved, I must still maintain.

There is one species more of artifice, perhaps unheard of before, adopted by our Author, to elude the force of other instances: which is “*by a judicious reunion and arrangement of the dispersed*

* Vind. p. 64.

† Exam. p. 46.

‡ Remarks, p. 67. To several other of the learned Doctor’s objections, he has only given such *dogmatical* answers: and what is more strange, is, that he should run into this strain while he is inveighing against the practice.—“The *dogmatical* part of their work, which in every sense of the word, deserves that appellation, is ill adapted to engage my attention, &c.” Yet in the very next page he says, “If I have rejected, and *rejected with some contempt*, the *interpolation* which pious fraud has very awkwardly inserted in the text of Josephus, &c.” May we not ask him in turn, *why so dogmatical then*, upon a point about which the learned are divided; most of them giving us their reasons for their several opinions, whereas Mr. G. has given none?

§ Vind. p. 103.

“*materials*

“ materials from several authors, to form a consistent and interesting narrative.”

XVI. There are five instances thus mixed up and qualified ; those of *Pliny*, *Orosius*, *Bayle*, *Fabricsius*, *Gregory of Tours*, with an *etcætera*, which, for aught I know, may be extended to every author cited by him *. These opposite testimonies he so dextrously manages, as to make them corroborate the same identical fact ; as an expert chymist causes liquors, of contrary qualities when separate, by a *judicious mixture*, to be absorbed in each other's powers. In plain truth, and to drop allusions ; it is a memorable rule for extracting from authors what they never wrote ; and allows one to strengthen any sentiment whatever by an authority which is in fact directly opposite.

No writer of romance could wish for a greater liberty. In this way it would be easy so to blend the evidence of original history, that the narrative, like Jack's coat, as represented by the witty Dean, should fit the shape of every one.

One might collect a defence of Christianity from *Voltaire's* works, or *Mr. Gibbon's* two obnoxious chapters ; and the Bible might furnish a treatise against religion. Nothing should be inserted which, is “ not proved by some one of the witnesses ;” but the reader could not be so unreasonable as “ to expect that each of them,” (as their testimony might be opposite) “ should vouch for the whole, nor that one should define the boundaries of their respective property †.” If *Mr. Gibbon* did not so strenuously talk against popery in his *Vindication* ‡, I should suspect that he intended to imitate it's favourite mode of dividing and trans-

* Vind. p. 59.

† Ibid. p. 59.

‡ Ibid. p. 65.

ferring sins ; and though I may perhaps, without the fear of incurring much shame, confess that *I was totally ignorant of this new mode of historical composition* *, introduced by the Historian of the Roman empire ; yet, till I find that the *generality* of historians have followed the practice of displaying pompous but *useless* authorities in their notes, I shall add these to the former number, which is now increased to *sixteen* vain attempts to remove my charge.

I come now to those instances in which he has thought proper to descend to particulars.

EUSEBIUS.

XVII. The story of Nemesion is the first instance from Eusebius attacked by Mr. G.—“ In the relation of which,” he says, “ I have really suppressed several material circumstances †.” I wish for no better proof of the truth of my former charge, and my justification in the present case, than our Author’s own narrative.

The pages of my *Examination*, which precede the notice I have taken of this fact, give a more particular account of the persecution at Alexandria, and the number of the martyrs, than Mr. Gibbon has even now given. The whole story of Nemesion is extracted from the Greek of Eusebius, which I produced in my note ; the substance of it was inserted in my text. It is absurd, therefore, to imagine I could hope to conceal any part from my reader’s observation, unless I could imagine no one would read the Greek. The words which our Author has translated, as containing “ *several material circumstances really sup-*

* Vind. p. 58.

† Ibid. p. 49.

“ *pressed*

“ pressed by me ; make for my purpose, not against
 “ me.” He himself allows, that this “ Egyptian
 “ was *falsely* or *maliciously* accused as a companion of
 “ robbers. Before the centurion he *justified himself*
 “ from [he was acquitted of] this calumny, which
 “ did not relate to him (*αλλοτριωτατην* *very improba-*
 “ *ble, foreign*) : but being charged as a Christian he
 “ was brought before the governor,” &c. And if I
 passed over this proof of the Roman governor’s
 justice, in inflicting on an innocent person a dou-
 ble measure of tortures, laying the principal stress
 on Nemefion’s suffering as a Christian, it was not
 omitted by my brother *sycophant* *, as Mr. Gibbon
 facetiously stiles us ; nor will it establish the infe-
 rence he wishes to draw from it. “ It is no less
 “ evident,” says he “ that whatever might be the
 “ opinion of the centurion, the supreme magi-
 “ strate considered Nemefion as guilty, and that
 “ he affected to shew, by the measure of his tor-
 “ tures, and by the companions of his execution,
 “ that he punished him, not only as a Christian,
 “ but as a robber †.” This is a pretty extraordi-
 nary assertion : it is plain from Dionysius that Ne-
 mesion was accused to the governor *only of being a*
Christian ‡ ; the governor could only take cogni-
 sance of that charge : and the order (“ that after
 inflicting on Nemefion *a double measure of stripes*
and tortures,—he should be burnt with the
 robbers,”) could not have been given, had he
 been deemed a robber himself. As to the mea-
 sures of his tortures, and the companions of his
 execution—if any conclusion can be drawn from
 thence to his being considered as a robber, it

* Dr. Chelsum’s Remarks, p. 209, &c.

† Vind. p. 43.

‡ Dionysius apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 41. See
 Exam. p. 62.

would prove equally that Christ suffered for murder and sedition*.

Mr. Gibbon may content himself with saying *Nemesion was accused*; but we will add, it was a *false* accusation: he may insinuate that he suffered as a robber; but he must first make it appear that the governor was acquainted with the former accusation: and though I admire the plausible pretext of which he avails himself, I fear he will not be able, to convince the learned and impartial, that *he himself has been falsely accused*. Therefore I conclude that his attempt to vindicate himself, proceeds on either Misapprehensions or Misrepresentations; and it ends only in a compliment to his own candour, for giving a wrong sense to a Greek word, used by the historian.

XVIII. The third remark taken notice of by my antagonist respects the propriety of his quoting, under the name of Jerom, "the Chronicle which he ought to have described as the work and property of Eusebius †." The learning so ostentatiously displayed by him, and introduced with such a pomp of words, is enough to dazzle and confound a young student, whom, he elsewhere boldly represents as, "hastily consulting an unknown author, on a subject with which he is unacquainted ‡."

I know

* I know not whether I am obliged to the *candour* or to the *learning* of my opponent, that he scorned to take notice of the *gross blunder* I had been guilty of, in translating the deponent verb *crimino* in a passive sense. *I am falsely charged*—for *I charge falsely*; but I am as willing to confess an error, as to stand firm to what I have justly advanced.

† Vind. p. 46.

‡ Vind. p. 10. I cannot help animadverting on the unkind manner in which Mr. G. here speaks of *Scaliger*, as well
as

I know not why Mr. G. should be displeased that I gave him so fair an opportunity of enquiring into, and informing the world of the history of this Chronicle of Eusebius. But though "I give credit to *the Historian of the Roman Empire*, when he affirms, that he consulted a Latin Chronicle of the affairs of that Empire;" yet I shall, in my turn, perhaps, be credited, if I shew that I *know something more of it beside the name and the title-page*. No doubt, in some cases, there would have been no great impropriety in quoting this Chronicle under the name of *Jerom*. Mr. G. allows that "some chronological fragments which had successively passed through the hands of

as *Jerom*, and *Rufinus*; at the very moment in which he must be sensible how much he is indebted to their learning.

"But that proud critic," says he (meaning Scaliger) "always ready to applaud his own success, did not flatter himself that he had restored the hundredth part of the genuine *Chronicle of Eusebius*."

And again: "The second book" (of the Chronicle of Eusebius) "was translated into Latin by *Jerom*, with the freedom, or rather licence, which that voluminous author, as well as his friend or enemy *Rufinus*, always assumed."

This ungrateful behaviour puts me in mind of the reproof given by Dr. Bentley to his opponent; who, like my adversary, was "not contented with abusing the ancients, unless he bestow his civilities upon some of the greatest of the moderns. *Salmasius*," he says, "and *Scaliger*, were all *Gall and Pride and Pedantry*." &c. In answer to this, the learned Bentley says,—“If a magisterial air, and too much heat and passion, appear in their writings, a candid reader will forgive it, and say, *Sume superbiam Quasitam meritis*; he'll impute some of it to their temper, but most to the ill usage they met with from envy and detraction. To hate and despise a man, at the same time they are profiting by him, is an ill mixture of the worst of human passions. A little haughtiness and warmth, when accompanied with merit, will be forgiven by some, but such black ingratitude will be hated and despised by all.” Bentley's Preface to *Dissertations on Phalaris*, p. 102.

“ Africanus and Eusebius, are still extant ;” and as *he talks so familiarly of the Chronicle of Eusebius*, he, surely, *will not be surprised* to hear that, fortunately for me, the passage in dispute still exists in the Greek original, and removes the little ambiguity in the Latin word *movisset*. The Greek stands thus : *Αυρηλιανος ΜΕΛΛΩΝ διωγμον κινειν κατα Χριστιανων βειω κεραυνω διακωλυεται* *.—Thus the History of Eusebius and his Chronicle speak precisely the same sense. The language of the original is not ambiguous ; and Eusebius himself ought to have been appealed to, and not his interpreter.

In my *Examination* I observed, that “ the Latin expression of the Chronicle, Cum adversum “ nos persecutionem *movisset*,” implied *much more than hostile intentions* † ; but upon more critical inspection, I am of opinion that the Latin word *movisset* does not necessarily signify that the persecution was begun. The phrases *multa movens animo*, — *majus opus moveo* ‡, denote a design not put in execution.

I am able also to shew, in contradiction to our Author’s assertion, that many learned men have *not* thought the expression of the Chronicle of Jerom *always proper* ; Lardner, speaking of this very passage, quotes it from Jerom’s Latin edition of the *Chronicle of Eusebius* ; I might specify also Usher, Reland, Prideaux, Helvicus, Mosheim, Bentley, &c. §.

* Euseb. Chronicon. p. 222, ed. Scaliger. in *Thesaurο Temp.* Amstelod. 1658.

† Exam. p. 66.

‡ Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. vii. 45. l. x. 890.

§ The expression of Bentley is worthy notice.—“ But St. Jerom, out of some unknown Chronologer (for that note “ is not extant in the Greek of *Eusebius*), gives a different “ time of his reign.” Bentley’s *Dissert. on the Epistles of Phalaris*, p. 28.

The very title of the book, as I before observed, is *Eusebii Chronicon Divo Hieronymo Interprete*: and I do not find that the generality of authors deal so unfairly and unkindly with Eusebius as to give up the credit of his laborious chronicle to the name of *Jerom*, for his trouble in translating it.

Let us put a similar case:—We have only a Latin, and barbarous translation of the works of *Irenæus*, the original Greek being entirely lost, except a few fragments: but how absurd and ridiculous would it appear, if *Jerom* had been this Latin interpreter, to stile the book, *Hieronymus adversus Hæreses*. With the same reason therefore that we still call the translation *Irenæus adversus Hæreses*, we are to quote the *Chronicle* as the *work of Eusebius*.

With regard to the persecution of Aurelian, the reality of which I seemed to favour, in my *Examination**; I can easily shew that my opinion is confirmed by respectable authority. Lardner thus states the case:

“ I proceed to the only thing farther to be observed concerning *Aurelian*, that by divers Christian authors he is reckoned among the persecutors of the church. Sulpicius Severus quite omits him, in his catalogue. Nevertheless Eusebius adds †—
 “ Thus was *Aurelian* affected towards us at that
 “ time, but in the farther advances of his empire,
 “ his mind was altered towards us, owing to
 “ the advices of some men about him, so that he
 “ raised a persecution against us. Much discourse
 “ there was every where about it. But the divine
 “ justice arrested him, when he was just signing
 “ the edicts against us: so, as it were, holding

* Exam. p. 66.

† Hist. Eccles. l. vii. c. 30.

“ his hand, that he should not perform what he had designed, &c.”

“ In Jerom’s Latin edition of the *Chronicle of Eusebius*, it is said, “ that when *Aurelian* had raised a persecution against us, he was terrified by lightning, that fell near him and his companions, and soon after he was slain *.”

“ Orosius † speaks much to the like purpose, and makes this the ninth persecution.” Dr. Lardner then quotes the author of the deaths of persecutors ‡, and Augustin §, who “ expressly mentions this among the other heathen persecutions of the Christians, and reckons it the ninth.”

“ Mr. Dodwell || supposeth, that *Aurelian*’s persecution was only intended, and not put in execution. And indeed Eusebius has so expressed himself about this matter, in his Ecclesiastical History, as has occasioned some learned men to hesitate about it. But upon more carefully examining his words, and observing the accounts of other authors, learned men**, have generally, and, as I think, very judiciously, determined, that *Aurelian* not only intended, but did actually persecute. But his persecution was short, he having died soon after the publication of his edicts.”

“ Mr. Mosheim is of opinion, that many Christians did not suffer at this time. But, †† considering

* Chron. p. 177.

† L. vii. c. 23.

‡ Cap. vi.

§ De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. cap. 52.

|| De paucitate Mart. § 64. init.

** Non intentatam modo, sed executioni quoque brevissimo tempore mandatam, nobis est infixum in animo. Basnag. ann. 275, n. ii. Et conf. Pagi ann. 272, n. iv.—xii. et 273.

†† Mosheim de reb. &c. p. 558. Aurelianus, qui Claudium, &c.—præteritis atrocius futurum fuisset,

Aurelian’s

“ *Aurelian’s* cruel temper, and how much he was
 “ addicted to the superstitions of Gentilism, he
 “ thinks, that if he had lived, his persecution would
 “ have exceeded all the former persecutions in se-
 “ verity *.”

We may surely therefore conclude that Aurelian had actually carried his hostile intentions into execution.

CYPRIAN.

XIX. I have already shewn that Mr. Gibbon’s *single instance of legal delay* granted to an accused Christian, which he cited from *Justin Martyr*, avails little to prove that it was *the general practice* of the Roman magistrates. The division of my charges obliged me to separate the authorities by which he endeavours to establish the fact. In the one I had mis-stated the circumstance; in the other quoted from *Cyprian*, our author is totally wrong. He tells us, “ This observation had been suggested, partly by a general expression of Cyprian, *Dies negantibus præstitutus †, &c.*” On the contrary, it appears from the whole passage in this Father, that “ there were proclamations issued by governors or other magistrates, determining a fixed day for every Christian to renounce his faith: all who were suspected, and did not comply with this edict, were immediately after the fixed day, without farther trial, held guilty, and punished either with death, confiscation of goods, or banishment ‡.” What hu-

* *Heathen Testimonies*, vol. iii. p. 117, 4^o ed. Lond. 1766.

† *Vind.* p. 49.

‡ *Cyprian*, p. 122, edit. Fell. Oxon, 1682. “ *Cum dies negantibus præstitutus excessit; quisquis professus intra diem non est, Christianum se esse confessus est,*” &c. See also the note on this passage,

manity

manity either Mosheim or Mr. Gibbon can discover in such proceedings I know not.—I do not believe any thing more detestable can be proved against the cruellest Inquisitor *.

TILLEMONT.

* My adversary having taken no notice of the four instances which I urged in my Examination (p. 47—53. 109.) of his having misrepresented *Cyprian*, so that I shall have only this opportunity of saying any thing of that Father; I shall make use of it to lay before my reader Dr. *Burgb's* opinion (Inquiry, p. 308.) of our Historian's unjust representation of the character of this bishop and martyr.

“ To the name of *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, the world has lately been introduced. How far his character and conduct have been justly delineated, it is not my province to enquire. I am contented, that a fervent zeal to unite, shall still be construed into an artful ambition to rule the Church of Christ; that the strenuous effort to check the progress of error, shall still be construed into the claim or exercise of an usurped prerogative. I have no immediate motive to deny, that the utmost felicity of human life is constituted by the mitigation of exile, and the safety of a certain bishop judiciously exemplified in the proscription, the banishment, and the murder of *Cyprian*. The tenets, not the virtues, of the early Christians form the subject of the present inquiry; and to the ascertainment of the former, the vindication of the latter is by no means necessary. Let persecution continue to enjoy the advocacy of a new-found apologist, and, assuming the symbols of justice, inflict a merited punishment on the guilt of Christianity, I am not now concerned to repel the blow; I have not undertaken to exculpate the members, but to investigate and promulge the doctrine of the primitive Church.

The establishment of dates, however, is within my province, and therefore it is necessary, that the merit of killing *Cyprian*, since meritorious we are taught to conceive it, should be resumed from *Decius*, to whom it has been erroneously ascribed, and restored to its proper owner, the Emperor *Valerian*. But where the humility, with which this martyr professed the hope of eternal glory to be his sole motive for preferring death to the abjuration of his faith in Christ, is represented as mere affectations, there I acquiesce; nay, I must accede; for, upon setting aside the testimony of every ancient record, it appears upon the stronger evidence of modern suggestion

TILLEMONT.

XX. Mr. Gibbon has attempted to defend his partial representation of a passage of Gregory of Tours, taken from Tillemont*, which was censured by me†, and which was deemed also by Dr. Randolph worthy of censure. But let us observe the mode of his defence :

He first most artfully disjoins the phrases “ *de la ville & des environs* (the town and its environs), “ *tant de la ville que de la campagne* (as well of “ *the city as the country*),” which seemed to confine the limits of the extensive diocese, and places before his reader’s eye the words “ *Les environs, “ la campagne, le pays d’alentour*” (the last of which relates to another matter) to make them appear synonymous to the word *diocese*. Yet even the reason which he now assigns in his *Vindication*, does not seem to authorise this translation : but the chief point is, his omission of the subsequent passage, which will still wear a *partial and suspicious aspect*; especially as his chief argument now advanced in excuse depends on his insinuating that these conversions were *fabulous*. He says “ Such “ was the inconsiderable flock which Gregory began to feed about the year two hundred and “ forty, and the real or *fabulous* conversions ascribed

suggestion (and who can resist it ?) that he was instigated to extend his neck to the stroke of a common executioner by that far more adequate principle, the most aspiring temporal ambition.”

See Mr. Gibbon’s History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. i. p. 546.—Vide Cypriani Opera prope passim, præsertim ad Demetrianum lib. p. 193.

* Vind. p. 75.

† Exam. p. 136.

“ to

“ to that wonder-working bishop during a reign
“ of thirty years *.”

It is no wonder that our author should endeavour to make the amazing conversion appear fabulous ; as *it suits his hypothesis* of confining the limits of the progress of the Gospel. But one who believes the influence of the Spirit to have been so great, that three thousand souls were converted by one sermon of St. Peter's, will not think it very incredible, that the same co-operating grace should prosper, and bless the ministry of Bishop Gregory, so as to produce the effect above mentioned, in the course of thirty years.

But however it be, surely as Mr. G. had taken the former part of the story from Tillemont, to use Dr. Randolph's words,—“ common candour,
“ and the acknowledged fundamental laws of
“ history, seem to have required that the *subsequent*
“ success of Christianity should have been related,
“ as well as the prevalence of Paganism †.”

But this, as I have shewn, is not the only instance in which he has unfaithfully borrowed from Tillemont, and most ungratefully misrepresented the learned compilations to which he was indebted.

TERTULLIAN.

XXI. I had given, in my *Examination*, an instance of our author's *mutilating and mis-*“ *trans-*
“ *lating a passage* which he produces, to bring in
“ this Father guilty of passing an unjust sentence
“ of *condemnation on the wisest and most virtuous of*
“ *the Pagans ‡.*”

* Vind. p. 77.

† Remarks, p. 160.

‡ Exam. p. 29.

I translated

I translated Tertullian's words *literally*, and put Mr. Gibbon's translation in an opposite column, that the reader might be sensible of the *material* sentences omitted by him, and omitted probably because they contain the reasons assigned by Tertullian for this harsh language, and might in some degree extenuate his severity. But he says, with uncommon assurance,—“ Happy should I “ think myself, if the materials of my History “ could be always exposed to the examination of “ the public; and I shall content myself with appealing to the impartial reader, whether *my version of this passage is not as fair and as faithful as the more literal translation which Mr. Davis “ has exhibited in an opposite column* *.” Does he think that no one can read Tertullian's own words? Or does he persuade himself that his *positive assertion* will set aside the testimony of our senses? Where has he translated these sentences: “ Ille “ ultimus et perpetuus judicii dies, *ille nationibus “ insperatus, ille derisus, cum tanta sæculi vetustas, “ et tot ejus nativitates uno igne baurientur* :” Again, “ Tot spectans ac tantos reges, *qui in calam recepti “ nuntiabantur, cum ipso Jove ac ipsis suis testibus in “ imis tenebris congemiscences* ?” And above all, those peculiar words,—“ Sapientes illos philosophos—*quibus nihil ad Deum pertinere suadebant, “ quibus animas, aut nullas, aut non in pristina corpora redituras adfirmabant* † ?” And where does he meet with the words—*so many poets, so many magistrates, &c.*—in the original?

But though he has passed over these extenuations, he still, in his *Vindication*, pursues and exaggerates the *infernal description*. He informs us that

* Vind. p. 30, 31.

† See Exam. p. 29, 30. Tertullian. de Spectaculis, c. 30.

Tertullian

Tertullian “alludes to the improvement which
 “the agility of the dancers, the *red* livery of the
 “charioteers, and the attitudes of the wrestlers,
 “would derive from the effects of fire.” For my
 own part, I think that his words do not refer to
 these only, but rather point out the base corrup-
 tion of morals which brought the people into the
 situation which he describes. He is speaking as an
 Orator to dissuade* ; he is not expressing a wish.

Aptly indeed has a late ingenious writer, speak-
 ing of the primitive Christians, put this question
 to Mr. Gibbon : “Why, but for the pleasure of
 “dwelling upon faults and exposing weaknesses,
 “are both exhibited with such frequent care and
 “critical caution? Why was the flaming zeal of
 “the stern *Tertullian* drawn from its obscurity?
 “Why was it given us in its horrid colours—not
 “in *all* its horrid colours indeed, because you have
 “contrived to heighten the terror of the picture,
 “by affecting to draw that veil over a part, with
 “which you ought rather to have covered the
 “whole †?”

Our author then proceeds to another point ; “I
 “cannot refuse to answer Mr. Davis’s very par-
 “ticular question, Why I appeal to Tertullian
 “for the condemnation of the wisest and most
 “virtuous of the Pagans? *Because* I am inclined

* Mr. Gibbon might have seen, that M. de Tillemont, whom he follows on other occasions pretty closely, inclines to my interpretation ; that it was written to *dissuade* the Christians from frequenting the public shows.

“Tertullien rapporte (dans le livre des spectacles) quel-
 “ques exemples du jugement que Dieu avoit exercé sur les
 “Chrétiens qui alloient aux spectacles, pour montrer com-
 “bien ces divertissemens profanes luy étoient en abomina-
 “tion.” Tom. iii. part 1, p. 355. art. 6.

† Dialogues of the Dead with the Living, p. 182. Printed for Conant and Payne. 1779.

“to

“ to bestow that epithet on Trajan and the Antonines, Homer and Euripides, Plato and Aristotle, who are all manifestly included within the fiery description which I had produced *.”

But give me leave to ask if there were no bad and sceptical philosophers ; no loose and profligate Poets and Tragedians, in or about the time of Tertullian, that this respectable group should only be brought forward ? or were any of them, except Trajan and the Antonines, born after the birth of Christ ? if not, our Historian himself tells us, that *a charitable hope might be indulged in their favour* †. But we need not wonder that he should, with so little foundation, earnestly endeavour to represent this doctrine of “ the condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans, as *the belief of the primitive church* ;” and with slyest insinuation tell us, that “ the Janesists, who have so diligently studied the works of the Fathers, maintain this sentiment with distinguished zeal ;” as if it was owing to that cause ‡ : for he does not hesitate to assert, that it is *still the public doctrine of all the Christian churches* ; and in his *Vindication*, to offer as an apology the following evasive sentence :—“ I shall submit to the judgment of the public, whether the Athanasian Creed is not read and received in the church of England, and whether the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans believed the catholic faith, which is declared in the Athanasian Creed to be absolutely necessary for salvation §.”

* Vind. p. 31, 32.

† History, p. 473.

‡ Note 68. c. xv.

§ Vind. p. 103.

Is it not strange, that such a reason as this should be employed by the Historian of the Roman Empire? Can he himself be so deluded as to suppose the most illiterate of his readers will for a single moment remain a dupe to such sophistry? Where are all his rules of logic, of which he boasts? By what reasoning can he prove that a test of faith was of force before ever it was established? or that a creed, drawn up for the use and confession of *Christians*, is to be extended, in its sense, to *Pagans*. But, as the Athanasian doctrine has given occasion of offence to some Christians, it suited well with his purpose of weakening the influence of religion, to advance this controversial argument *.

But to return to Tertullian:—Mr. Gibbon in his *Vindication* says, “As I was sensible, that the Montanism of Tertullian is the convenient screen which our orthodox divines have placed before his errors, I have, with peculiar caution, confined myself to those works which were composed in the more early and sounder part of his life †.”

Our author does not seem to be much acquainted with this matter; for he seldom quotes those books which are usually supposed by the learned to be written before he became a Montanist, and generally those which were undoubtedly written after he adopted the reveries of that sect.

The learned reader will not be displeased to

* The reader who wishes to examine further into the design and import of the Athanasian Creed, will find it ably defended by *Wheatley* on the Common Prayer; *Waterland* on the Athanasian Creed; and by *Horbery*, in a sermon on that subject.

† Vind. p. 33.

have a view of the point in question. I shall therefore present to him the opinions of authors of credit who have attempted to fix the period.

Dr. Lardner thus speaks of it*:—"Many learned men have employed their labour in settling the time of the several works of this author.—*Cave* reckons but three of his books writ while he was a catholic, &c.—Du Pin places his *Apology* in 200 (and says, he became an open Montanist about 205).—*Basnage* †, in 203.—*Pagi* in 205 ‡; but I think his arguments not sufficient to prove it so late."

The three treatises selected by *Cave* (who generally follows the order of *Allix*, in this point) as written previous to the heresy of Tertullian, are those, *De Baptismo*; *De Pœnitentia*; & *De Oratione* §.

Tillemont places his *Apology*, and his treatise on *public shows*, among his orthodox books ||: but that *Allix* and *Du Pin* differ from him in his opinion, he himself tells us ††.

It

* *Credibility of the Gospel History*, vol. ii. c. 27. on Tertullian, p. 569. 8vo. ed.

† A. D. 200. sect. 8.

‡ Critic. in Baron. A. D. 199. sect. 6.

§ *Cave* justly points out the confusion and debates which have arisen on this subject, and thus delivers his sentiment;

"De tempore atque ordine, quo in scriptis suis exarandis usus est Tertullianus litem haud exiguam movent eruditi. In his cum Doctiss. D. *Allix* (Dissert. de Tertull. vit. & script.) rei veritatem proxime omnium attingisse videatur, ordinem ab eo designatum in enumerandis Tertulliani operibus præcipue sequar, ita tamen, ut in nonnullis a viro clarissimo non possum non dissentire. Ante lapsum scripta.

De Baptismo. De Pœnitentia liber. De Oratione." *Cave*, Script. Eccles. Hist. Literar. tom. i. p. 92. fol. Oxon. 1740.

|| *Tillemont*, Mem. Eccles. tom. iii. part 1. not. 25. sur Tertullien.

†† Tom. iii. part 1. note xi. p. 546. D'Allix vit. Tertul.

F

c. 6.

It is therefore plain that we shall take the mean and more probable computation, by fixing his lapse into Montanism to the year 200*. Mosheim, in his Dissertation on the Apology, justly complains of the obscurity and perplexity which embarrasses the subject †.

But there is one treatise in particular, *De Corona*, which Mr. G. endeavours to prove to have been *written before he was engaged in the errors of the Montanists* ‡. But *I shall be*, in my turn, *morose enough to overwhelm him with a load of quotations*, which all his learning will not be able to remove; to shew that this assertion is contrary to the sentiments of the learned,

In the dissertation which Mosheim has written to fix the date of Tertullian's Apology, we meet with the following note.

“ The book of this African (*de Corona militis*) was written at a time in which the church had enjoyed a long interval of peace. This can be no other than that which preceded the persecution of Severus, about the year 202, which produced the Apology. Therefore in

c. 6. p. 46. Du Pin. p. 248. (p. 90. 4^o ed. Paris 1690.) See also Rigalt's Dissertation prefixed to his edition of Tertullian: and Forbeshus, vol. iii. l. 7. c. 8. § 16.

* “ Circa mediam aetatem, teste Hieronymo, (*de Script. c. 53.*) —anno uti non male conjici potest 199.) ad Montani dogma prolabitur.” Cave, *Hist. Liter.* p. 91.

† Hoc non possum, quia moneam, ex præceptis & dogmatibus Tertulliani vix judicari posse, quosnam ille libros ante, quosnam post defectionem suam ad Montanistam conscripserit. Nam plerisque eorum errorum, quos in Montano Christiani recte sentientes damnavunt, jam ante fovit homo hic supra modum tristis & severus, quam Montanus res novas inter Christianos moliretur. Parum scilicet novi Montanus docuit Tertullianum: qui propterea tantum hominem illum amplexus est, quod eum in plerisque secum consentientem cernebat.” Mosheim, *Dissertat.* vol. i. p. 54. not.

‡ Note 49. c. xv.

" the book *de Corona*, Tertullian was already a Montanist, as all the commentators agree." Upon which words Mosheim makes this observation; " The force of this learned person's reasonings turn to this point; Tertullian wrote his treatise *de Corona* a little before the beginning of the persecution by Severus: and that he was engaged in the sect of the Montanists when he wrote this book is the opinion of all the interpreters §."

This date of Tertullian *de Corona*, adopted by Mosheim, must carry great weight with it, as his enquiries were extensive and minute; and directed to the particular consideration of this Father's works. But I shall still add to this by producing other authority.

Du Pin ranks the treatise *de Corona* among the works of Tertullian which were certainly composed after he was a Montanist*.

Alix, and *Cave* after him, suppose it to be written about the year 208†; and consequently class it with those works which were written after his lapse into heresy.

I shall therefore conclude, supported by so strong and respectable a body of authors, that notwithstanding Mr. G.'s objection, the arguments of

§ Le livre de cet Africain *de la Couronne du soldat*, &c. Mosheim. Dissertat. de Apologet. Tertull. p. 53. Bibliotheca Rationnée Amstelod. tom. ii. Part. ii. p. 292. This is introduced in the Bibliotheca Rationnée, in the account given of Mr. Jackson's edition of the works of Novatianus, and is a critique on one of his notes.

* Voilà tous les ouvrages qu'on peut attribuer à Tertullien orthodoxe, tous les autres étant certainement écrits, après qu'il a été Montaniste.

Le Livre de la Couronne is among the last class. Bibliotheca, p. 92, 93.

† Hist. Literar. p. 92. " Post lapsum.—De Corona mihi licetis circa an. 208. scriptus."

Tillemont are sufficient to confirm his *wishes* and opinion. He insists upon the circumstances mentioned in the treatise, "of there being two Emperors, and the long peace which the church had enjoyed, but which was now threatened with a persecution; as well as upon the subject of it, which displays an enthusiastic zeal and schismatic spirit." I conclude therefore, with him, that the treatise de Corona was undoubtedly written after Tertullian was a Montanist †.

On the Apocalypse.

It is evident from the representation which our Historian has given of the reception of the Apo-

† "Il est indubitable qu'il a écrit son livre de la Couronne depuis son schisme, en un temps où il y avoit deux Empereurs, lorsque l'Eglise estoit depuis long temps dans la paix & dans une grande tranquillité, mais qu'on craignoit devoir estre suivie d'une persecution. En considerant toute l'histoire du temps de Tertullien, il est difficile de placer ces choses que vers la 6^e année de Severe, en 198. ou 199. ou au commencement de Maximin, qui avoit associé son fils à l'Empire. Mais comme nous ne voyons pas moyen de dire que Tertullien fut Montaniste des 199. ni de quelques années après: il reste qu'il ait écrit ce livre au commencement de Maximin vers l'an 235, &c. Mem. Eccles. tom. iii. art. 6. p. 384.

Mais le sujet sur lequel il le fit étant une partie considerable de l'histoire de l'Eglise, nous en ferons ici le récit dans ses propres termes, pleins de ce faux zele & de cet esprit schismatique & superbe dont il estoit possédé. Ibid. p. 385.

It should be observed that Tillemont fairly translates his author, saying, "*the soldier appeared with his crown in his hand.*" Paroissoit seul la couronne à la main.

But Mr. G. has already been told, by his anonymous opponent, of his unfair representation of the soldier's behaviour, and "desired to convince the unlearned part of his readers, that *laurum in manu gestare*, was to throw away *his crown of laurel.*"

See "A short Appeal to the Public;" p. 22. and "A few Remarks," p. 16.

calypse,

calypse, that he has a great desire to invalidate its authenticity. I have already shewn in my *Examination*, that some of the authorities by which he would support his attack on this book of the New Testament, were insufficient; and Dr. Chelsum has confuted the rest. But as he says in his *Vindication*, that *he shall easily wipe away these imputations*, I shall give the matter, as it is important, a more full consideration.

It is thus introduced in his history; "A mysterious prophecy, which still forms a part of a sacred canon, but which was thought to favour the exploded sentiment (of the Millenium) has very narrowly escaped the proscription of the church *." The first confirmation which he gives of this, in his note, respecting the decree of the council of Laodicea, has been fully answered by the learned Dr. Chelsum; who has shewn on the best authority, that "it is *not proscribed* by them, but only is not enjoined to be read †; and that this was occasioned only by it's being thought too mysterious to be rightly understood by common hearers ‡." Indeed Mr. Gibbon has entirely acquiesced in his opponent's argument; and in his *Vindication* allows the very fact

* History, p. 472.

† Remarks, p. 58. Twells' Critical Examen, &c.

‡ Bp. Cofin's Scholastical History, &c. Bp. Gibson's Third Pastoral Letter (p. 207, &c. 8vo. ed. Lond. 1760.)

In a learned work of Mr. Gregory, M. A. of Ch. Ch. we meet with the following passage:

"The printed Arabic hath it (the Revelations) so the Coptic, Armenian, &c. What if the Laodicean canon acknowledge it not? it is more to be marvelled at that it should be found in the Apostolical. In the Greek I do not say, but in the Arabic translation it is thus mentioned, "*The sixth is the Revelation of St. John, called Apocalypsis*," &c. Gregory's Works, Preface, 4^o ed.

for which he contended—" The assembled Bishops of Asia, after enumerating all the books of the Old and New Testament *which should be READ in churches*, omit the Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse alone *." But the conclusion which he draws from the tacit omission does not hold good, if this interpretation be granted. I shall therefore proceed to the testimony of Sulpicius Severus, with whom I am myself more especially concerned.

XXI. " We may learn," says Mr. Gibbon, " from the complaint of Sulpicius Severus, that the sentence (of the Laodicean council) had been ratified by the greater number of Christians of his time †." I luckily discovered in Sulpicius the passage to which our Historian alludes, which contains *no such complaint*, nor any *ratification* of such a sentence. I observed also, that " the original word *plerique*," which is translated by him the *greater number*, cannot have this import here ; and gave a proof from *Quintilian*, that *plerique* does not always imply a *majority* ‡. But Mr. G. in his *Vindication*, most wittily replies, " I am found guilty of supposing *plerique* to signify *the greater number* ; whereas Mr. Davis, with Stephens's dictionary in his hand, is able to prove that *plerique* has not *always* that extensive meaning, and that a classic of good authority has used the word in a much more limited and qualified sense §."

My reader, surely, will not think my translation of this passage unfaithful, when he knows that Dr. Lardner gives it the same turn ; " He (Sulpicius Severus) says, that *John*, the Apostle and

* Vind. p. 37.

† Note 65. c. xv.

‡ Exam. p. 40—42.

§ Vind. p. 35.

" Evangelist,

" Evangelist, was banished by *Domitian* into the
 " isle *Patmos*, where he had visions, and where he
 " wrote the book of the Revelation; which is,
 " either foolishly or wickedly rejected by *many* *."

Beside this, it is impossible to set aside his
 sneer more fully, or confirm my former assertion
 more strongly, than by proving to my reader, that
 having carefully collected from the works of Sul-
 picius several passages in which the word *plerique*
 occurs, I find that he *generally* uses it in this limited
 sense; for there are a number of passages where it
 must of necessity be taken so, and a still greater
 number that will admit of it. Some of which, and
 references to more, the reader may see in my
 notes †.

It

* *Credibility*, vol. xi. p. 11, 12. Sulp. Severus, *Hist.*
Sacr. l. ii. cap. 31. al. 45.

† " Hujus (Cham) filius, Chus nomine, Nembrod gi-
 gantem genuit: à quo Babylon civitas constructa traditur.
Pleraque etiam oppida ea tempestate condita memorantur, &c."
Sacr. Hist. l. i. p. 8. 12mo. Elzevir. ed. 1656.

" Media hyeme, quæ solito asperior inhorruerat, adeo ut
plerisque vis alioris extingueret." Vita Martin. c. ii. p. 218.

There is one particular instance where Sulpicius Severus
 himself explains the word.

" *Plerique* mortales studio gloriæ sæcularis inaniter dediti,
 exinde perennem (ut putabant) memoriam nominis sui quæ-
 siverunt, si vitas clarorum virorum stylo illustrassent." The
 sense is carried on, and in the next page this *plerique* is ex-
 pressed by the very word *multos*.—" Siquidem ad solam ho-
 minum memoriam se perpetuandos crediderunt; cum hominis
 officium sit, perennem potius vitam, quam perennem memo-
 riam, querere, non scribendo, aut pugnando, vel philoso-
 phando, sed pie, sancte, religioseque vivendo. Qui quidem
 error humanus, literis traditus, in tantum valuit, ut *multos*
 plane æmulos vel inania philosophiæ vel stultæ illius virtutis
 invenerit."

Vita Martini. Prologus, p. 215. See also Sulp. Sever.
 l. i. p. 38. (and the passage in 1 Sam. c. ii. to which it
 alludes.)

It avails little then for Mr. G. to say, that “ he stands under the protection of the general usage of the Latin language ;” for it was much altered long before Sulpicius Severus wrote, and we are to judge of the author’s sense of a word from the signification in which he generally uses it himself. But we have reason to suspect that our Historian before only consulted *Abauzit* ; in that case he could have no knowledge of this argument, and was not aware that it might be so forcibly brought against him.

He seems now to have looked a little further into this matter : for in his *Vindication* he says, “ the Ecclesiastical history of the fourth century illustrates and justifies this obvious interpretation *.”—“ May I not affirm, on the authority of St. Jerom, that the Apocalypse was generally rejected by the Greek churches ? Quod si eam (the Epistle to the Hebrews) Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas Canonicas ; nec Græcorum Ecclesiæ Apocalypsim Johannis eadem libertate suscipiunt. Et tamen nos

alludes.) p. 96, p. 100, p. 113, p. 45. 59. 74. Vita Martin. c. vii. p. 226. xxv. p. 240. 244. Ibid. Ep. i. Ep. ii. p. 250. Dialog. i. p. 274, p. 277. ii. p. 305. iii. p. 313.

* Another objection against the Apocalypse, which Mr. G. borrowed from *Abauzit* (note 152, c. xv.) respecting “ the Alogians, who disputed its genuineness because the church of Thyatira was not yet founded ;” is now set aside by the ingenuity of Dr. Burgh. He shews, that “ this was not the reason that the Alogians rejected it : otherwise they could hardly have ascribed it to the pen of Cerinthus, who was the contemporary of St. John—and that Epiphanius only allows the fact for the sake of retorting their own argument on themselves : and concludes, that *the church of Thyatira was founded* when St. John wrote the second chapter of the Apocalypse.” See Burgh’s Inquiry into the belief of the first Christians, p. 75.

“ utramque

“ utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum auctoritatem sequentes *.”

No, good Sir! you may not so affirm. The clause “ nec Græcorum Ecclesiæ, &c.” may be true if *some* of the churches rejected the Apocalypse; if they doubted, hesitated, or shewed some reluctance in admitting it; did not receive it with the same *freedom*, and entire satisfaction as those books whose authenticity had never been questioned. This seems to be the meaning: yet I will so far grant, that perhaps the words *may* be understood thus: “ neither do the Greek churches, by the same liberty (i. e. by using the liberty of judging and determining the canon of Scripture) receive these books.” But I appeal to the reader, if this sense is not more forced and elliptical. It is more natural to suppose *Jerom* is speaking of the age after the authority of the Apocalypse, and the

* Vind. p. 37. Hieronym. Epist. ad Dardanum, tom. iii. p. 68.—There still remain evident traces that our author follows Abauzit’s discourse on the Apocalypse; for the substance of his observations, added in the *Vindication*, appears to be taken from this fountain-head of his intelligence.—Abauzit says, “ *Les Eglises Grecques, dit-il (S. jerom) ne reçoivent point l’Apocalypse; & cette prévention étoit si fort à la mode, qu’il l’appelle la coutume de son siècle.*” Sect. 88.

Il (St. Augustin) faisoit dépendre l’autorité des Livres Sacrés, non seulement du nombre, mais aussi de la grandeur & de la majesté des Eglises Chrétiennes qui les avoient reçus, &c. Sect. 85. p. 299.

Est ce qu’il cherchoit le nombre, la grandeur, la majesté des Eglises, pour se déterminer? Tout cela se trouvoit dans les Eglises *Grecques*, pour le moins autant que dans les *Latines*. Sect. 86, p. 301. Discours historique sur l’Apocalypse.

And again.—L’Apocalypse s’introduisoit ainsi peu à peu, sur-tout depuis que le faux Denys Areopagite, qui la mettoit au rang des Livres Sacrés, commençoit à passer chés les Grecs pour le véritable Denys. S. Maxime, dans le septième siècle fit fort valoir cet auteur; &c. *ibid.*, p. 315.

epistle

epistle to the Hebrews had been doubted; “ *but we, says he, following the authority of the primitive ages*” (before such disputes began,) “ *receive both of them.*”

On the contrary, that the Apocalypse was *not generally rejected* by the Greek churches, we can prove from more positive evidence than a single and ambiguous clause; I mean from *the numerous testimonies of the Greek as well as the Latin Fathers*, as Mr. Gibbon has already been told by Dr. Chelsum, *in favour of the authenticity of this book* *. Among other learned authorities, he was referred to the third Pastoral Letter of Bp. Gibson; but as he still refuses to listen to this admonition, or has neglected to consult such weighty evidence, I shall produce, for the satisfaction of my reader, the citations of the learned Prelate.

“ *Irenæus*, who mentions it as the Revelation of “ *St. John the Disciple of our Lord* †; “ *Justin Martyr* ‡, “ *Eusebius* §, “ *Clemens Alexandrinus* ||, “ *Fertullian*, who cites it under the name “ *of John the Apostle* **; and “ *Origen*, where he “ *speaks of the banishment of John the brother of* “ *James into the island Patmos*, “ *speaks also of the* “ *revelation there made to him*, and cites the book “ *under his name* ††.”

To this respectable body, we may add those whom Dr. *Mill* quotes, as ranking the Apocalypse

* Remarks, p. 60, &c.

† Irenæus, l. iv. c. 37. 50. l. v. c. 26.

‡ Dialog. Tryph. xx.

§ Hist. Eccles. l. iii. c. 18.

|| Ibid. l. iii. c. 23. (Pædag. l. ii. c. 12. Strom. vi. p. 867.)

** De Præscript. c. 36. contr. Marcion. l. iv. c. 37.

†† Comment. Matth. p. 417.

among

among the canonical books * : namely, *Theophilus Antiochenus* †, *Papias* ‡, *Melito* §, *Apollonius* ||, *Cyprian* **, *Hilarius*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, *Dionysius Areopagita*, *Gregorius Nyssenus*, *Ambrosius*, *Augustinus*, *Paires concilii Carthaginensis*, and others whom I need not mention particularly by name.

I shall therefore conclude from all these testimonies, that both the Greek and Latin churches received the Apocalypse into the sacred Canon, long before the *sixth* century, on better grounds than the authority of Mr. G.'s impostor.

XXII. We have seen what little reason our Historian had for assigning *imposture* as the cause of the reception of the Apocalypse in the Greek church. I shall proceed to shew that he is equally unfair in stating the motives which induced the Council of Trent to fix the seal of their infallibility on this book. He says, " A just apprehension that the Grammarians might become more important than the Theologians, engaged the Council of Trent to fix the seal of their infallibility on all the books of scripture, contained in the Latin Vulgate, in the number of which, the Apocalypse was fortunately included ††." What could any reader conclude from this last sentence, but that the fate of the Apocalypse depended upon the council's decree concerning the Vulgate. I cannot but think our author meant that it should be so understood.

* Mill's edition of the Greek Testament, in the notes before the Apocalypse.

† Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv. 24.

‡ Ibid. l. iii. 39.

§ Ibid. l. iv. c. 26.

|| Ibid. l. v. c. 18.

** De bono pudicit, xxii. 9.

†† Note 65, c. xv.

But

But unfortunately for him there is no ground for it.

I must in my turn beg that the reader will peruse that *incomparable Historian* Father Paul. He will find in him that the council had *two distinct things* under consideration; as the state of the case will fully explain. *Brent*, in his translation, says,

“ Order was taken that in the points of doctrine
“ to be decided, articles should be extracted out
“ of the books of the Lutherans contrary to the
“ orthodox faith, to be studied and *censured* by the
“ divines *.”

In consequence, *five* articles were drawn out. With the condemnation of the second and third only we are concerned.

II. “ That among the books of the old Testament, none should be reckoned but those that
“ have been received by the Jews, and in the
“ New, the six Epistles, that is, under the name
“ of St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, that of St. James,
“ the 2d of St. Peter, the 2d and 3d of St. John,
“ one of St. Jude, and the *Apocalypse*.”

III. “ That to understand the Scripture well,
“ or to allege the proper words, it is necessary to
“ have recourse to the texts of the original tongue
“ in which it is written, and to reprove the Latin
“ translation.”

In debating on the *second* article; “ they all
“ agreed in this, that a catalogue should be made
“ (as in former times) of the canonical books, in
“ which all should be registered which are read in
“ the *Roman* church, even those of the Old Testa-

* *Brent's Translation of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent*, l. ii. p. 141. fol. ed. Lond. 1676.

“ *Fù preso ordine, &c. Hist. del Concil. Tridentino Di Pietro Soave Polano*, l. ii. p. 145, fol. Lond. 1619.

“ ment,

“ ment, which were never received by the Hebrews *.”

“ There were four different opinions on the article : but the one which was *approved of by the majority, was to make no distinction at all* † ; (as to establishing the three ranks which were proposed, of those books which always have been held for divine: those whereof sometimes doubt hath been made, but by use have obtained canonical authority ; in which number was the Apocalypse : and those of which there hath never been any assurance) *but to imitate the council of Carthage and others, making the catalogue, and saying no more* ‡.”

It appears from the history, that in the four different methods proposed to make the catalogue of the Scriptures, the Apocalypse is included (virtually at least) in every one. The first does not expressly mention it, but necessarily implies it. The second method mentions the Apocalypse expressly ; and supplies what the first mentions only generally. And in the two last it is undoubtedly included.

How groundless therefore is Mr. Gibbon's remark that, “ *I have ONLY mistaken a motion of the opposition for a measure of the administration, &c.* §” since it appears from Father Paul, that even the administration as well as the oppo-

“ * Nel 2° articolo le opinioni furono conformi in questo, &c. p. 148.

† Il Di 15, proposte le tre formule, se ben ciascuna ebbe chi la sostenne, la terza però fu approvata dalla maggior parte, p. 150.

‡ Altri ripetevano meglio non far alcuna distinzione, ma imitare il Concilio Cartaginese, & gli altri, ponendo il Catalogo senza dire più parole.

§ Vind. p. 37.

sition

sition never had the least idea of rejecting the Apocalypse.

I indeed pointed out, in my *Examination*, the second proposal, which was advanced, but which was not adopted; for to me it appeared to give a more plain account of their intentions, and the reason of their proceedings.

It is plain then how much Mr. Gibbon has mistaken the *sagacious Historian*. But he adds, “the judicious Le Courayer, who had studied his author—considers this *ridiculous* reason as the most powerful argument which influenced the debates of the council*.”

Give me leave to ask our author, what debates they were which, as Courayer says, this powerful argument influenced? Does he agree with our Roman Historian, and assign this fear of the superiority of the Grammarians *as the cause of the reception of the Apocalypse in the Roman church*? No such thing; Mr. G. has falsely quoted him. As he judiciously studied Father Paul, he confines this motive to the influence it had in causing the Fathers to prefer the Vulgate translation to the original: his words are, “The fear that the Grammarians should make themselves arbiters of the truths of religion does not prevent an original from being preferable to a translation; but it was however this reason which principally influenced the Fathers of the Council to determine in favour of a translation†.”

I appeal

* Vind. p. 38.

† I have given the whole note from Courayer.—“*Ces nouveaux Grammairiens jeteroient de la confusion par tout, &c.*” Ces sortes de raisons populaires, qui réellement n'ont aucune solidité, sont pourtant ordinairement celles qui ont le plus d'influence dans les décisions. La crainte de voir des Grammairiens s'eriger en Juges des veritez de la Religion

I appeal to my reader, if Mr. G. has not evidently mistaken or misrepresented the sense of this note. As he hastily consulted this author, he met a sentence that seemed to favour his hypothesis, but forgot that it related to a different article. We cannot but lament his superficial mode of compiling history; surely if he had himself more sagaciously studied the council, or more judiciously read Courayer, he could not have fallen into this ridiculous blunder.

Having closed the debates on the *second* article, and settled *the catalogue of the canonical books of Scripture*; among which we find they all agreed unanimously to rank the *Apocalypse*; they proceeded to discuss the *third* article, respecting the *Vulgate* or Latin translation of the Scriptures.—Here, and not before, came on the contest between the Grammarians and the Theologians. The Grammarians contended for their Latin translation being compared with the Hebrew and Greek originals; the divines opposed this measure. However, “the difficulties were not so great, says F. Paul, but that the *vulgar* edition was approved almost by a general consent; the discourse (the argument) having made deep impression in their minds, That Grammarians would take upon them to teach bishops and divines.

As a still stronger proof that these were two different and distinct considerations we may ob-

Religion n'empêche pas qu'un original ne soit préférable à des Traductions; mais c'est pourtant ce qui a principalement déterminé les Pères du Concile à juger en faveur d'une Traduction, de peur de laisser prendre aux Grammairiens une autorité que les Evêques, qui ne sont pas toujours les plus habiles, craignoient de trouver très préjudiciable à la leur.”
Courayer Hist. du Concile de Trente, tom. i. p. 245.

serve,

serve, that there were two separate decrees established, and afterwards published, in the session, on these articles : “ The decree concerning the canonical Scriptures, and the decree of the edition and use of the sacred books *.”

Thus Mr. G. has confounded together, what should have been kept separate ; if we are to determine by the relation of Father Paul, to which he himself appeals—and I leave it to the reader to judge if his representation of this matter does not discover more of the fallacy of a sophist, then the plain and manly truth of an Historian.

By Mr. Gibbon's remark, that the Apocalypse was *fortunately* included among the books of Scripture contained in the Latin Vulgate, it is plain he would convey to his reader the idea, that it's reception into the canon depended on it's having a place there.

But how can this insinuation have any weight, when we find the Apocalypse in the several editions of the Greek Testament published before the council of Trent in 1546 †, and consequently before

* *Decretum de canonicis scripturis,*” &c.

“ Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum censuit, ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint, qui ab ipsa Synodo suscipiantur. Sunt vero infrascripti testamenti veteris, Genesis, &c. Testamenti novi, quatuor evangelia, &c.—& *Apocalypsis Joannis Apostoli,*” &c.

“ *Decretum de editione & usu sacrorum librorum.*”—“ Insuper eadem sacrosancta Synodus,—statuit & declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus & *vulgata editio*, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est,—pro authentica habeatur ; & ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat, &c.”

Concilii Tridentini General. Sessio, iv. A. C. 1546.—Concil. tom. 35, p. 387, 388, ed. Paris, Regia, 1644.

† Bibliotheca sacra, at the end of Calmet's Dictionary, vol. iii. part 3, art ix.—Novum Testamentum Græcè—in Polyglottis

fore the decree which preferred the Vulgate could have any influence.

We know it was universally received in the Latin church long before the council of Trent; and therefore at a time when the interested motive which he assigns, had it been true, could not have contributed towards its reception. But I have already shewn that such a motive is void of foundation, and our author's attempt to invalidate the authenticity of this book is baffled even by the arguments which he has himself advanced.

Let us now see what reason he is pleased to give for the reception of the Apocalypse in the *Protestant* churches. "The advantage," (he says) "of turning those mysterious prophecies against the see of Rome, inspired the Protestants with uncommon veneration for so useful an ally."

To the honour of our reformers it may be said, that so ignominious a reason for the insertion of this book in the canon of Scripture is utterly without ground. They were men of too much virtue and moderation, and were too great lovers of truth, to act upon such motives. I may say the same of their successors, both clergy and laity; they have met the adversaries of the book upon the proper ground of controversy, and have maintained its authenticity with such arguments as will not give way to the cavils of this gentleman. Our reformers found this book in all the editions of the Greek Testament published to their time, and every translation of it from Wicliff to the Reformation. And we may add, that it had been full as

Polyglottis Complutensibus ann. 1514, editum, sed publicatum duntaxat post ann. 1522.—Erasmio Roterod. recognitum, 1516.—Aldi et Aufulani—Venetiis, 1518.—Colinzi, 1545.—Robert. Stephani, 1546.

G

fortunate

fortunate for the church of Rome had the Apocalypse not been included in the Vulgate.

As Mr. G. has thought fit on this occasion to appeal to "the ingenious and elegant discourses" of the present Bishop of Lichfield on that *unpromising* subject; I cannot better conclude this head, than in the words of the learned Prelate.—(Serm. x. vol. ii. p. 111.)

"As to the *authority* of this extraordinary book (although the discussion of this point be foreign to my present purpose) it may be proper to acquaint such persons, as have not made the enquiry for themselves, and are perhaps incapable of making it, with the sentiments, which our ablest writers have entertained of it."

"Mr. Mede, a capable inquirer, if there ever was any, (having no *vanity* to indulge—with no *interest* in view—with no *spleen* to gratify) says roundly—The Apocalypse hath more human (not to speak of *divine*) authority, than any other book of the New Testament besides, even from the time it was first delivered." (Works, p. 602.)

—And to the same purpose, *Sir Isaac Newton*,—"I do not find any other book of the New Testament so strongly attested, or commented upon so early, as this of the Apocalypse." *Observations on Daniel*, &c, p. 249.

"Thus, these two incomparable men. What some minute critics have said, or insinuated, to the contrary, is not worth mentioning; farther, than just to observe, that, if the authority of this momentous book be indeed questionable, the church of Rome could hardly have failed long since to make the discovery, or to triumph in it.

Hæc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ."

I have now closed the several heads under which I proposed to rank the articles brought in question by Mr. Gibbon; but I have another class still to add, *of those which he has not attempted to confute*, contenting himself with saying, “the few imputations which I have neglected are still more palpably false, or still more evidently trifling*.”

To shew what little credit is due to this assertion, I have drawn out a catalogue of the MISREPRESENTATIONS charged upon him in my *Examination*, to which he makes no reply in his *Vindication*, amounting only to the *small number of twenty-nine*. But to avoid repetition, I must refer the reader, who wishes to be satisfied of their truth and importance, to my former work. I must however beg leave to ask Mr. Gibbon, how it is possible, that, “*in every assault*, my weapons have fallen dead and lifeless to the ground; when there are so many, which I shall consider as successful, which he has not even attempted to repel†.”

* Vind. p. 80.

† As Mr. Gibbon has thought it worthy his notice to censure a slip of the pen, as a proof of *my bad English*; I shall in turn desire him to correct the *inconsistency* of the two members of this period. He tells his readers, “*in every assault*, my weapons have fallen dead and lifeless to the ground;” but, unfortunately for me, *they come to life again*; and “*have more than once recoiled and dangerously wounded the unskilful hand that had presumed to use them.*” May not this be justly called an *artful carelessness*?

Mr. GIBBON'S Misrepresentations of Authors.

	Pages.
1 Instance from the Universal History, —	13.
6 Instances from Tertullian, —	25, 33, 34, 36, 37.
With the note * —	39.
4 from Cyprian, —	47, 53, 109, 110.
2 — Origen, —	53, 60.
5 — Eusebius, —	60, 61, 63, 66, 70.
2 — Lactantius, —	77, 80.
1 — Epictetus, —	84.
1 — Marcus Antoninus, —	86.
2 — Grotius, —	91, 95.
1 — Bossuet, —	98.
1 — Le Clerc —	102.
1 — Du Pin, —	132.
1 — Tillemont, —	138.
1 — Lord Lyttelton, —	140.

29

So that upon the whole, the balance stands thus :

First class, containing those instances in which I have been mistaken, —	8
Second class, those in which I have erred in some subordinate point, but wherein the main charge is right, — —	8
Third class, those attempted by Mr. G. but which I cannot be so polite as to give up, —	23
Fourth class, those which he has not attempted, —	29

Total 68

From this table it appears, that I have been convicted of only *eight* trifling mistakes out of *sixty-eight* instances ; so that there are still remaining *sixty* substantial proofs of *misrepresentation*, which Mr. G. with all his artifice and plausibility will find difficult to confute.

I might

I might have easily lengthened out the detail of his MISREPRESENTATIONS and INACCURACIES from the large compilations I have by me : but satisfied that I have sufficiently established my charge, I need not intrude any longer on my reader's patience.

The judicious Mr. *Baker* has an observation respecting modern Historians, which, though I would not extend it to all in general, as he has done, may with the strictest propriety be applied to the *Historian of the Roman Empire*.

“ I scarce ever met with any Historian who
 “ does not write true History, if you will take
 “ an account of him from his *Preface*, and *not be*
 “ *too nice in examining his book* : the first pages are
 “ usually filled with the care and integrity of the
 “ author, which, possibly, are to be found no
 “ where else †.”

Now that I have gone through these several unconnected passages, in which our Historian has had recourse to misrepresentation ; I shall beg leave to consider his groundless and malevolent assertions respecting THE JEWISH NATION and RELIGION more fully and minutely : for Mr. Gibbon in his *Vindication* still persists in his former account of them, and attempts to justify his confused and unfair narrative. Slips of memory, involuntary mistakes, and even errors of judgment, may be entitled to some candour and allowance. But subtle and deceitful glosses, false colouring, and wilful mistakes obstinately defended, admit of no excuse.

INTOLERANCE OF POLYTHEISM.

The zeal, the *intolerant zeal of the Jews*, to which the equally intolerant zeal of the *Christians*

† *Baker's Reflections upon Learning*, c. x. p. 127.

succeeded, is assigned by Mr. Gibbon as the first cause of the rapid progress of Christianity. Dr. Watson has ably pointed out the insufficiency of this cause ; or rather, shewn that it would necessarily impede, instead of facilitating its progress *. My province is to animadvert upon the facts which our Historian has advanced, and his manner of stating them. And I shall be able to confute, by the most convincing testimonies, his account of the *mild* genius of Polytheism ; and thereby prove that the intolerance which he ascribes only to the *Jewish* nation and law, is most directly applicable to other people and other legislatures. The discussion of this question is of the utmost importance ; for, if Mr. G.'s representation is well-founded, it will follow, that Polytheism or idolatry is preferable to Theism, or the worship of the one true God. To prejudice, if not subvert Christianity, is the design of those who have supported the argument ; they have all inadvertently betrayed, or openly avowed, the intent ; nor can we consider Mr. Gibbon to be more friendly to Christianity than Collins, or Hume †.

Our

* Mr. Smyth Loftus published a supplement, or continuation of Dr. Watson's apology, entitled, *A Reply to the Reasonings of Mr. Gibbon, &c.* but Mr. G. has omitted to take notice of him among those adversaries "whom he salutes with gentle courtesy, or stern defiance."

† "The intolerance of almost all the religions, says Mr. Hume, which have maintained the unity of God, is as remarkable as the contrary principle of Polytheists. The implacable narrow spirit of the *Jews*, is well known, &c.—And if among Christians, the *English* and *Dutch* have embraced the principles of toleration, this singularity has proceeded from the steady resolution of the civil magistrate, in opposition to the continued efforts of priests and bigots."

"Idolatry is attended with this evident advantage, that by limiting the powers and functions of its deities, it naturally admits the Gods of other sects and nations, to a share of

Our author begins with this remarkable assertion—"We have already described the religious harmony of the ancient world; and the facility with which the most different and even hostile nations embraced, or at least respected, each other's superstitions †." He says, that he has described; but his descriptions are too like his proofs. Whatever can be warped to his purpose, is introduced; and every thing which makes against him is omitted. As to the religious harmony of the ancient world, nothing of this nature can be inferred from history. In many nations there remained more or less an indifference and disregard about foreign rites; which afforded an opportunity to persons devoted to superstition, to make innovations in the popular system, and privately to introduce a new mode of worship. Hence foreign rites were sometimes tolerated. There are however many

of divinity; and renders all the various deities, as well as rites, ceremonies, or traditions, compatible with each other." On the other hand;—"While one sole object of devotion is acknowledged, the worship of other deities is regarded as absurd and impious.—As each sect is positive that its own faith and worship are entirely acceptable to the Deity;—the several sects fall naturally into animosity, and mutually discharge on each other that sacred zeal and rancour, the most furious and implacable of all human passions.—The tolerating spirit of idolaters, both in ancient and modern times, is very obvious," &c. *Natural History of Religion*, Sect. ix. 8vo. ed.

Mr. Gibbon says,—“The superstition of the people was not embittered by any mixture of theological rancour; nor was it confined by the chains of any speculative system. The devout polytheist, though fondly attached to his national rites, admitted with implicit faith the different religions of the earth.” *Decline and Fall*, p. 30.

“Reasoners of such a cast were scarcely inclined to wrangle about their respective modes of faith, or of worship.” *Ibid.* p. 32.

† *Decline and Fall*, p. 451.

G 4

instances

instances of their being execrated and banished : feuds also and seditions arose on that account ; so that this general correspondence and concord in reality never existed. What agreement was there between the Persians and the people of Egypt, when Cambyfes entered that country, and slew the priests, and ruined their temples ? Or, in still more ancient times, when the Arabian shepherds made an inroad into the same kingdom, and demolished the temples and altars : and bitterly persecuted the people ? If we may trust the accounts of the natives, the tyranny of these foreigners, and their cruelty, was beyond all example : and the whole proceeded from a detestation of the popular religion. Cambyfes was not content with the desolation which he brought upon Egypt ; but purposed to have penetrated to the famous temple of Ammon ; and to have laid that also in ruins ; but he failed in the attempt. Both the Arabians and the Persians esteemed their own rites as more pure and refined than those of the Egyptians ; which they looked upon as base, and not to be suffered. The Egyptians were not on their side at all more tolerant ; as we may learn from their tearing a Roman soldier to pieces for killing a cat ; also by their separating themselves from others ; and thinking themselves contaminated, if they drank out of the same cup, or eat at the same board. Hence we may too often find among nations a religious abhorrence, instead of universal harmony. When Xerxes invaded the Grecians, the same antipathy to the national worship took place as had before manifested itself in his grandfather Cambyfes. In consequence of this, his path might be marked, both in Greece and Ionia, by the altars and temples, and even cities, which he

he demolished *. It is plain therefore, that Mr. Gibbon had little reason to assert, that “such
“ was the mild spirit of antiquity, that the nations
“ were less attentive to the difference, than to the
“ resemblance, of their religious worship †.”

Nor was this disagreement only between nation and nation: the sentiments of people varied in each particular country. Some acquiesced in that mode of worship, which had been transmitted to them: others of a warmer zeal thought it might be enriched and improved by the admission of additional rites, and foreign mysteries. Hence innovations in religion were sometimes privately introduced even in Greece and Rome. But these improvements did not always succeed. So far from being readily and cordially embraced, they were many times execrated, and with detestation abolished. The Athenians had a law which prohibited the introduction of foreign deities; and though they were sometimes admitted, there are instances when they were despised and laughed at; and at last banished. An example to this purpose is to be found in the history of Aristophanes, who by his wit drove a herd of strange deities out of the city, as we are informed by Cicero. “*Novos vero Deos*
“ *sic Aristophanes, facetissimus poeta veteris Co-*
“ *mœdia, vexat, ut apud eum Sabazius, et qui-*
“ *dam alii Dii, peregrini judicati, é civitate ejici-*
“ *antur ‡.*” So far from embracing foreign rites with such an easy indifference, both the Athenians and Romans had laws to prevent their introduction.
“ *Cautum fuerat et apud Athenienses et apud Ro-*

* See Pausanias, l. vii. p. 533, and l. x. p. 837. Xerxes burnt all the temples in Ionia, except that at Ephesus. Strabo, l. xiv. p. 941.

† Decline and Fall, ch. li. p. 30.

‡ De legibus.

“ *manos*

“manos ne quis novas religiones introduceret *.”
 St. Paul was accused on this head, as being *ξενων
 δαιμονιων καταγγιλεως* †.

“The Roman laws,” says a judicious writer ‡,
 “were no less clear and severe in this respect.—
 “*Strange Gods shall not be worshiped. Deos pere-*
 “*grinos ne colunto.* Does a tolerating government
 “express itself thus?”

“But this is not all. Follow the history of this
 “great people, and you will find the same prohi-
 “bitions given by the senate in the year of Rome
 “325 §, and the Ediles charged to see to the
 “execution of them; these prohibitions renewed
 “in the year 529 ||; the Ediles severely rebuked
 “for having neglected these orders and superior
 “magistrates appointed to have the laws better
 “executed. Many decrees of Pontiffs, and Se-
 “natus consultums without number, against new
 “worship, quoted to the senate in 566 **, and a
 “strange worship proscribed in 623 ††.”

“This

* Servius in *Æneid.* l. viii. ver. 187.

† Act. Apost. c. xvii. v. 18.

‡ Author of the Letters of certain Jews to Mr. de Voltaire,
 vol. i. p. 270, &c.

§ “*Nec corpora modo affecta tabo. Sed animos quoque
 “multiplex religio & pleraque externa invasit;—donec pub-
 “licus jam pudor ad primores civitatis pervenit.—Datum
 “inde negotium Ædilibus ut animadverterent, ne qui, nisi
 “Romani Dii, neu quo alio more, quam patrio colerentur.”*
 Vid. Liv. lib. iv. n. 30.

|| Liv. l. xxv. n. 5.

** “*Quoties patrum avorumque ætate negotium hoc magi-
 “stratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent omnemque
 “disciplinam sacrificandi præterquam more Romano abole-
 “rent?”* Liv. lib. xxxix. n. 16.

†† “The worship of Jupiter Sabasius. With regard to
 “this worship, the wise Rollin observes, *That in every pe-
 “riod instances may be seen of the attention of the Romans to
 “keep off new sorts of superstition.* And Mr. de Voltaire
 “asserts

“ This intolerance was continued under the em-
 “ perors ; witness the * counsels of Mecænas to
 “ Augustus against those who should introduce, or
 “ honour in Rome, other gods than those of the
 “ empire. Witness the Egyptian superstitions,
 “ proscribed under this emperor, and under Ti-
 “ berius ; the Jews banished if they would not re-
 “ nounce their religion. But witness, above all,
 “ the Christians driven into exile, stripped of their
 “ property, and given up for so long a time, and
 “ in such great numbers, to the most cruel tor-
 “ ment, not for their crimes, but their religion,
 “ under Nero, Domitian, Maximian, Diocletian ;
 “ &c. &c. even under Trajan and Marcus Aure-
 “ lius, &c.”

But were one not to lay a stress on these proofs of intolerance and persecution, we find that instead of acceding to the worship of strange gods, many people were very doubtful and indifferent about the Deities of their own country. Others looked upon them with absolute contempt, and had them in derision. Such were Protagoras of Abdera, Theodorus Cyrenaicus, and Diagoras the Melian : such also Epicurus, and his numerous followers : and above all others, Lucian. It is

“ asserts in twenty places, coolly and without exception,
 “ that the Romans tolerated and permitted all kinds of wor-
 “ ship !”

* “ We think it proper to lay before the reader, in full, this passage of the historian. We shall translate it literally from the Greek text. “ *Honour the Gods with care, says Mecænas to Augustus, according to the customs of your fathers, and COMPEL others to honour them. HATE those who innovate in religion ; and PUNISH them, not only because of the Gods, he that despises them has no respect for any thing, but because they who introduce new Gods, prevail on many persons to follow strange laws, and that from thence arise associations by oath, cabals, parties, all things dangerous in a monarchy. Suffer no atheists nor magicians.*” Dion Cassius, lib. 42.

said

said of Nero, “ Religionum usque quaque contemp-
 “ tor præter unius Deæ Syriæ. Hanc mox ita spre-
 “ vit, ut urinâ contaminaret *.” The rites of
 Isis by degrees got footing at Rome: but seem
 by most to have been held in detestation. Cicero
 complains of the priests, and says of them,—“ do-
 “ mos exhaurire et urbem superstitione implere †.”
 Arnobius takes notice of the impurity of their
 worship, and particularly,—“ de stupris inter aras
 “ et delubra conductis ‡.” These rites had been
 unhappily restored in the times when he wrote,
 after they had been abolished in the consulship of
 Piso and Gabinius§. Tiberius prohibited all ex-
 otic ceremonies; and particularly those from
 Egypt and Judæa: “ Externas cæremonias,
 “ Ægyptios, Judaicosque ritus, compescuit ||.”
 Those from Egypt were too base and contemptible
 to be countenanced. Those from Judæa seemed
 to him inconsistent with the ancient national wor-
 ship. They were, in short, quite opposite to
 Polytheism and idolatry; and therefore could not
 be admitted. Virgil shews very little respect to
 the whole tribe of Egyptian deities; whom he
 comprehends under the title of “ Omnigenum
 “ Deum monstra; to which he adds, “ latrator Anu-
 “ bis.” Upon this Servius observes—“ Monstra
 “ dixit, quia necdum sub Augusto Ægyptiaca
 “ sacra Romani receperant: et Varro, Alexandri-
 “ nos Deos coli indignatur **.” From hence we
 may learn, that however innovations may have

* Sueton. in Neron. c. 56.

† De legibus.

‡ Tertullian likewise complains—“ In templis adulteria
 “ componi, inter aras lenocinia tractari.” Apologet.
 See also Ovid. Amor. lib. ii. Eleg. 2. ver. 25.

§ Valerius Maximus. lib. 4.

|| Sueton. in Tiberio. c. 56.

** In Æneid. lib. viii. 698.

crept

crept in, yet they were not introduced with that ease, nor received with that universal respect, which the Author pretends. Indeed there were laws to the contrary; and Dionysius Halicarnassensis commends the policy of the Romans in prohibiting foreign worship.

Mr. Gibbon quotes the testimony of this Historian, when he tells us, that "Rome was incessantly filled with subjects and strangers, who all introduced and enjoyed the favourite superstitions of their native country:" but he keeps back from our sight that part which does not suit with his purpose of setting forth the *easy indifference* of the Romans to religious worship. Dionysius is speaking in his second book of the institutions which Romulus made for the government of his state.

A due reverence for the gods is made the foundation on which the virtues of temperance, justice, and fortitude, which preserve and adorn a state, are grounded*. In the celebration of feasts and sacrifices, he rejected the vile and profane fables of the Greeks, and purged his religious ceremonies from the abominable rites which debased the worship of other foreign nations†. But if this does not indicate that indifference and universal respect which our author insists upon, much less do the following words of this Historian—

"What I most of all admire, says Dionysius, is, that although innumerable nations come to this city, (Rome) who necessarily worship their gods after the manner of their country; yet *no foreign worships are imitated by the state, so as to be received in public*: but if any sacred rites

* Πρωτην μὲν παρα τῶν θεῶν εὐνοίαν, &c. P. 87.

† Εὐλαδὺς ἀπαντὰ πρᾶττομεν τε καὶ λεγόμεθα τὰ περὶ τῶν θεῶν ὥς ἔτε παρ' Ἑλλήσιν, ἔτε παρὰ βαρβάροις.

" are

“ are introduced by the command of the oracles,
 “ such as are the rites of Idæa, they are worshipped
 “ in their own form, and every fabulous supersti-
 “ tion is rejected *.

Accordingly we read, that “ though the Præ-
 “ tors dedicated yearly feasts and games to the ho-
 “ nour of this goddess, yet the rites were per-
 “ formed by a *Pbrygian* man and woman. For
 “ *no native of Rome was permitted, by the law*
 “ *and the decree of the senate, to worship the god-*
 “ *dess in the Pbrygian customs.* In this prudent
 “ and cautious manner” continues he, “ does the
 “ state preterve itself with regard to the *foreign*
 “ modes of worshipping the gods: and *abstains*
 “ *from, and despises, every vain and indecent su-*
 “ *perstition.*”

How can Mr. G. reconcile this with what he
 says in the same paragraph, “ Rome gradually
 “ became the common temple of her subjects:
 “ and the freedom of the city was bestowed on
 “ all the gods of mankind?”

And although upon the besieging of cities, there

* Καὶ ὁ παντῶν μαλιστα ἐγὼγε τεθαυμάκα, καὶ πῶς μυρίων ὄσων
 εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐληλυθόντων ἐθνῶν, οἷς πολλὴ ἀνάγκη σέβειν τὰς πατρίους
 θεὰς τοῖς οἰκοδὸν νόμοις, ἑδενός εἰς ζῆλον ἐληλυθε τῶν ξενικῶν
 ἐπιτηδεύματων ἡ πόλις δημοσία, ὁ πολλὰς ἤδη συνῆθη παθεῖν, ἀλλὰ
 καὶ εἰ τίνα κατὰ χρεῖσιν ἐπεισηγαγέτο ἱερά, τοῖς ἑαυτῆς αὐτὰ
 τιμὰ νόμοις, ἀπάσαν ἐκβάλλουσα τερδρεῖαν μυθικήν, ὥσπερ τὰ τῆς
 Ἰδαίας ἱερά.

† Θεοσίας μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ ἀγῶνας ἀγεῖν ἀνα παῖν ἔτος οἱ
 στρατηγοὶ κατὰ τὰς Ῥωμαίων νόμους ἱεράται δὲ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ Φρυγῆ, καὶ
 γυνὴ Φρυγία—Ῥωμαίων δὲ τῶν ἀυθιγενῶν—οὔτε (τίς) οργιάζων τὴν
 Δίῳ τοῖς Φρυγίοις οργιασμοῖς, κατὰ νόμον ἢ σοφισμα βυλῆς. οὕτως
 εὐλαδῶς ἡ πόλις ἔχει πρὸς τὰ ἐκ ἐπιχωρίας ἐθῶ περι Θεῶν, καὶ
 πάντα στυγεῖται τυφόν, ὃ μὴ προσέτι το εὐπρεπές. Dionysius
 Halicarnass. c. xix. p. 88. fol. ed. Hudson, Oxon, 1704.
 In the same partial manner has he acted in quoting the tes-
 timonies of Herodotus, and Polybius, with regard to the
 nature of Polytheism, and the Roman worship.

was

was among the Romans a solemn invitation for the gods of each place to come over to them, yet there were innumerable deities of this sort, which were never enshrined at Rome. For neither there, nor at Athens, could foreign gods be admitted without a decree of the Senate; or a Permit from the Areopagus. Hence, though they conquered Egypt, yet they did not embrace the worship of Osyris or Orus; nor of Cnes, Bubastis or Thoth: nor did they pay any respect either to the *Ape*, or to the *Onion*. Of this we may be assured from *Juvenal*, who certainly, though he resided in Egypt, was no proselyte to the Egyptian rites, which he sufficiently ridicules.

“ Quis nescit, Volusi Bithynice, qualia demens
 “ Ægyptus portenta colat? crocodilon adorat
 “ Pars hæc: illa pavet saturam serpentibus Ibim.
 “ Effigies sacri nitet aurea cercopithecii.

* * * * *
 “ Porrum et cepe nefas violare ac frangere morsu.
 “ O! sanctas gentes, quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis
 “ Numina *.”

But what do such proofs avail, while the philosophic Mr. Gibbon can discover, (no doubt, *from a combination of facts*), that “ the Roman who deprecated the wrath of the Tiber, could *not* *ride* the Egyptian who presented his offering to the beneficent genius of the Nile †.”

The poet mentions also, as Herodotus had done before him, that the people in different districts were not uniform in their religious notions. Some held for sacred the very objects, which others looked upon with horror. He mentions the quarrels in consequence of this difference in opinion;

* Sat. 15.

† Decline and Fall, p. 30.

quarrels

quarrels of long standing, which had lasted for ages.

———“ *vetus atque antiqua simultas,
“ Immortale odium **”

He adds, that the people of Tentyra having taken one of the adverse party prisoner, cut him to pieces and devoured his limbs yet panting with life : to so great a pitch was their ferocity raised.

What was the respect shewn by *Horace* to the deities of his country ; and to religious worship in general ? Just none at all. He ridiculed the whole : and his sentiments about other deities may be traced in his reverence to Priapus.

“ *Olim truciſſus eram ficulnus inutile lignum :*

“ *Cum faber incertus, ſcamaum faceretne Priapum,*

“ *Maluit eſſe Deum : Deus hinc ego, furum
“ aviumque*

“ *Maxima formido.*”——

“ *Mentiar at ſiquid, merdis caput inquirar al-
“ bis †.*”

Priapus was by ſome nations held in great eſteem, and by Phornutus (or Cornutus) he is repreſented as the deity of nature, and the *Logos*, or ſoul of the world. But the Romans did not adopt this reverential regard : and Horace looked upon him as a mere ſcarecrow.

As the ſame worſhip was at times held in different eſtimation ; ſo likewiſe were the prieſts and diviners. Thus the Haruſpices had thoſe, who countenanced their pretenſions to divination ; but in general they muſt have been looked upon as ſo

* Sat. 15. ver. 33.

† Sat. viii. lib. 1.

many

many cheats, if we may judge from that proverbial expression mentioned by Cicero : " Mirabile
 " videtur, quod non rideat Haruspex, cum Ha-
 " suspicem viderit *."

These things most evidently prove that there was *not a religious harmony* among different nations, nor even in the same state. Nor did people with reverence embrace each other's superstitions : but on the contrary often despised them ; and held them in abhorrence. And this difference in opinion was frequently attended with popular animosities and persecutions. And now let me ask my reader what credit is due to the Historian of the Roman Empire, when he asserts ; that, " the religious concord of the world was principally supported by the implicit assent and reverence which the nations of antiquity expressed for their respective traditions and ceremonies †." But the whole of his argument is stale, and borrowed. For, in short, all that he has said about, " *religious harmony in the ancient world,*" and the happy consequences of heathenism, may be comprised in the words of Mr. Collins ; whose sentiments are the same, though expressed in other words. " *The infinite variety of opinions, religions, and worships, among the ancient heathens, never produced any disorder or confusion.*" What, says his learned Respondent ‡, *was it no disorder, when Socrates suffered death for his opinion : when Aristotle was impeached and fled : when Stilpo was banished : and when Diagoras was proscribed ? Were not the Epicureans driven out from several cities, for the debaucheries, and tumults they caused there ? Did not Antiochus banish all philosophers out of his whole*

* De Natur. Deor. lib. iii. c. 26.

† Decline and Fall, p. 520.

‡ The author of Philoleutherus Lipsienfis, p. 156.

H

" kingdom :

“ kingdom : and for any one to learn of them, made
 “ it death to the youth himself, and confiscation
 “ of goods to the parents ? Did not Domitian expel
 “ all the philosophers out of Rome and Italy ? Did
 “ the Galli, the vagabond priests of Cybele, make no
 “ disturbances in town or country ? Did not the Ro-
 “ mans frequently forbid strange rites, that had crept
 “ into the city ; and banish the authors of them ?
 “ Did the Bacchanals create no disorder in Rome,
 “ when they endangered the whole state : and thou-
 “ sands were put to death for having been initiated
 “ in them ? In a word, was that no disturbance in
 “ Egypt, which Juvenal tells of his own knowledge
 “ (and which frequently used to happen) when in two
 “ neighbouring cities their religious feuds ran so high,
 “ that at the annual festival of one, the other out of
 “ zeal went to disturb the solemnity ; and after thou-
 “ sands were fighting on both sides, and many eyes
 “ and noses lost, the scene ended in slaughter ; and the
 “ body slain was cut in bits, and eaten up raw by the
 “ enemies ? and all this barbarity was committed ;
 “ because the one side worshipped crocodiles ; and the
 “ other killed and eat them.”

“ Summus utrinque

“ Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum
 “ Odit uterque locus : cum solos credat habendos
 “ Esse Deos, quos ipse colit *.”

“ Let him go now and talk facetiously to his club,
 “ that among the Pagans there was no polemic Divi-
 “ nity.” So much for harmony in heathenism ;
 and its universal respect and reverence.

When our Historian had fully persuaded his
 unwary readers into an opinion of the easy indiffe-
 rence and toleration of Polytheism ; when he had

* Juvenal. Sat. xv.

worked

worked up their admiration for the mild genius of idolatry, by painting it in the most lively colours : it was then the proper time to introduce the worshippers of the one God to the greatest disadvantage ; and to make a contrast, by representing them as being distinguished by an *implacable intolerant* zeal ; arising, if we credit our philosopher, from the singularity of their worship, and the peculiarity of their tenets. Accordingly, we read, in the next sentence, “ *A single people refused to join in the common intercourse of mankind* *.”

This people, Mr. Gibbon tells us, were the *Jews*. But how did they stand out singly ; and make this refusal ? they did no more than their neighbours the Egyptians and Sidonians ; and many other nations upon earth. Besides, in religious matters there was no general and universal intercourse : and it was impossible for them to accede, where there was no uniformity. Whither should they betake themselves ? To the rites of *Mitbras*, or of *Osiris* ? to those of *Samothracia*, or of *Eleusis* ? To *Cronus*, or to *Baal* ? While the Jews remained in a flourishing state, they were in a manner secluded from the world, and persevered in the religion of their fathers. But the same was done by the Egyptians on one side of them, and by the Phenicians on the other. Why is that mentioned as single and extraordinary in them, which was common to other nations. If Mr. Gibbon would insinuate that they would not associate with other people, the accusation is not true : for they were to be found of old, as they are at this day, in all parts of the world. They adhered indeed to the religion, in which they had been instituted ; and married among those of their own race : and endea-

* Decline and Fall, p. 451.

voured to keep up the distinction of their tribes. The like was observable among the casts of the Indians, and the Gymnosophists : and in some degree among the Egyptians. But these peculiarities were a part of their religious institution, which they had the same right to follow, as any other people.

I have already shewn that " the rights of toleration were *not* held by mutual indulgence ;" as our Historian would persuade us ; on the contrary, it is proved, that " the payment of this tribute, though inflexibly refused by the Jews, was *not* refused by them *alone* *." Let him therefore again exert his philosophic discernment " to discover a more probable cause of the persecution of the Christians."

In the mean while, let us consider the representation which our Historian is pleased to give us of the state and condition of the Jews.

In his *Vindication*, he says, " the nature of my subject led me to mention, not the *real origin* of the Jews, but their *first appearance* to the eyes of other nations ; and I cannot avoid transcribing the short passage in which I introduced them. *The Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander,*" &c. †.

Surely this is a strange way of introducing them ! It betrays at once the designs of an enemy, to represent their *first appearance* to the eyes of other nations, as *the most despised portion of slaves*. In the nature of things, they must have been free before they were brought into slavery ; and we might pre-

* History, p. 520.

† Vind. p. 18.

sume there was some inducement, such as wealth, or dominion, to prevail on other nations to invade their right and property.

One might venture to assert that a monarch who reigned over “ *near seven millions of Subjects,*” according to Mr. G.’s own computation *, could not be totally unknown. And if we might be allowed to introduce the flourishing state of the Israelites, which the sacred history authorises; the glory of Solomon’s reign; his riches and power; his alliance, by marriage, with the king of *Egypt*; his trade and commerce with the kings of *Arabia*, *Tyre*, and *Syria*; his fame, which reached so far as the court of the Queen of Sheba †; and to repeat “ that he reigned over all the kings from the river “ even unto the land of the Philistines, and “ the border of *Egypt* ‡ :”—should we take this extensive view of the Jewish people, we might be fully authorised to say, that “ their first appearance to the eyes of other nations,” was not in a period wherein they were disgraced by a state of vassalage.

Mr. Gibbon may with some plausibility reply, that this glory relates to a period he did not mean to introduce; that he alluded to “ the age, in “ which the Jewish people, emerging from their “ obscurity, began to act a part in the society of “ nations, and to excite the curiosity of the *Greek* “ and *Roman* Historians §.”—But is the silence of *Herodotus* a fair evidence of their obscurity? And

* Vind. p. 23, 24.

† The commentators in general place her dominion in Arabia Felix. See Patrick on 1 Kings, ch. x. and 2 Chron. ch. ii. viii. ix.

‡ 2 Chron. ix. 26. Ezra, iv. 20. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 2. sect. 2.

§ Vind. p. 28.

is it the *first* time the Jews are mentioned by *Justin*, when he speaks of the siege of Jerusalem? Critics are of opinion that the former *spoke* of *Jerusalem*, which he visited in his travels through Judea, under the name of *Cadytis* *. And does not Justin go so far back as to speak of the origin, and departure of the Jews from Egypt †? Or even granting they were not described by these writers; no one surely will deny their acquaintance and connection with the *Egyptians*, a nation great and powerful at that time, before the *Grecian* or *Roman* name had acquired any celebrity.

Though obscurity may envelop and equivocation perplex this period of their history: yet with regard to the state of the Jews under the *Babylonians* and the *Persians*, we have the full light of sacred Scripture to direct us.

I have in my *Examination* taken notice, that if by the *Jews* our author means the *ten* tribes, they never emerged, nor returned home. If he means the real *Jews*, the *two* tribes of Judah and Benjamin, they were never in captivity under the *Assyrians*. Besides, they never languished, but for the most part seemed too well satisfied with their situation: much less did they languish for *ages*; and under the *Persians*. The whole of their captivity was but of seventy years duration: and in the very first year of the Persian monarchy they had a permit to return. I have said, and must still maintain, that one shall scarcely find in so small a compass such a number of inaccuracies ‡.

Mr. Gibbon, in answer to this, has endeavoured to shew, in his *Vindication*, that both the *Jews*

* See Prideaux's remarks on this matter; *Connections* vol. i. p. 44. 291. Herodotus, lib. ii. c. 159. l. iii. c. 5.

† Justin. l. xxxvi.

‡ Exam. p. 2, 3, &c.

and

and the people of *Israel* were often spoken of in this indiscriminate manner : and that the *Babylonians* and *Affyrians* were one and the same people*.

He does indeed allow, that “ the name of *Jews* “ in the times which precede the captivity, is “ used in the more general sense with some sort of “ *impropriety* †.” But he attempts to justify himself by speaking of it “ as the practice of the best “ writers. Josephus, Reland, and Prideaux, are “ cited as examples ‡.” Let us see how far their authorities avail him.

His argument, drawn from the title of their respective works, is so fallacious, that it must strike every one. Shall we call the *ancient Gauls*, *Frenchmen*, because a person writing the history of the French should introduce them into his work ? Or are we to stile our *British* ancestors *Englishmen*, be-

* Vind. p. 19, 20.

† Now, though we should accede to Mr. G.’s interpretation, yet, to preserve an agreement with history, he is reduced to the sad dilemma of being forced to give different interpretations to the same words.

First, the word *Jews* means the *ten tribes of Israel* conquered and enslaved by the *Affyrians*; and “ languishing for many ages” under their successors. Secondly, It means the *two tribes of Judah and Benjamin*, when they were under the Persian monarchy, and “ emerged from obscurity under the successors of Alexander.”

Again, the word *Affyrian* is confined to its own proper import, when that nation overcame the people and kings of *Israel*: but its signification is extended to imply the *Babylonians*, when he chooses to say, the *Jews* were “ the most despised portion of the *Affyrian* slaves.” Thus does he continually shift his ground to evade the accusation.

“ Verum ubi correptum manibus vinclisque tenebris

“ Tum variæ illudent species atque ora——

“ Sed quanto ille magis formas se vertet in omnes,

“ Tanto, gnate, magis contende tenacia vincla.” VIRGIL.

‡ Vind. p. 20.

H 4

cause

cause the country has since been called *England*? But I shall proceed to shew that each of these writers “ assign the strict and proper limits to those “ national denominations.”

In the words of the learned *Prideaux*, I can give at the same time the opinion, (or rather the definition) given by *Josephus*, on whose authority it is quoted, as to this question. “ On the return of “ *Judab* and *Benjamin* from the *Babylonish* captivity, some also of each of the other tribes of “ *Israel* returned with them out of *Affyria*, *Babylon*, and *Media*, whither they had been before “ carried.—But the most of them that returned “ being of the tribe of *Judab*, that swallowed up “ the names of all the rest; for from this time the “ whole people of *Israel*, of what tribe soever they “ were, began to be called *Jews*, and by that name “ they have all of them been ever since known all “ the world over *.”

In the definition which *Reland* gives of the word *Judæa* (not *Jews*), he remarks, that “ it “ properly means the land of *Judab* and *Benjamin*; “ while it often implies the whole land of *Israel*, “ varying its signification with the times to which “ it relates †.”

Josephus

* *Prideaux's Connection*, vol. i. part ii. book 3d, p. 150. See this distinction observed, vol. i. p. 24. 48. 54. 61, &c.

Εκλήθησαν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα (ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ) ἐξ ἧς ἡμέρας αἰσῆσαν ἐκ Βαβυλωνος, ἀπο τῆς Ἰουδᾶ φυλῆς, ἧς πρῶτης ἐλθούσης εἰς αἰωνὸς τῆς γῆς, αὐτοὶ ἴσιν καὶ ἡ χώρα τῆς προσηγορίας αὐτῆς μεταβάσιν.—*Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 5. sect. 7. ed. Havercamp.*

† “ *Nomen terræ Judæ, sive יְרֵמְיָהּ שְׂרָא proprie illam tantum regionem significat, quæ a tribu Juda possessa fuit, et scisso in duas partes regno, quarum illa Judæ hæc Israël dicta postmodum fuit, terras duarum præcipue tribuum Judæ et Benjaminis: At videtur in ipso veteri instrumento nonnunquam nomen Judæ, sive terra Judæ, latius accipi pro universa terra Israelitica, &c. Reland. l. i. c. 6. De nomine Judæ,*

p. 32,

Josephus is very accurate and particular in his use of the terms *Jews* and *Israelites*, and constantly preserves the distinction through his history. The *ten* tribes are called *Israelites* *. The *two* tribes of Judah and Benjamin, are styled the *Jews* †.

We have now seen that the very writers to whom Mr. Gibbon appeals, point out and preserve the distinction of terms, which he confusedly adopts.

With regard to the indiscriminate use of the words *Babylonian* and *Assyrian*, Mr. Gibbon has, with great confidence, rested the point upon a passage in the Prophet Isaiah ‡, who, says he, “in the name of Jehovah, announcing the downfall of *Babylon*, and the deliverance of Israel, declares “with an oath; *And as I have purposed, the thing shall stand: to crush the ASSYRIAN in my land, and to trample him on my mountains. Then shall his yoke depart from off them; and his burthen shall be removed from off their shoulders.*”

I know not how to venture my opinion in opposition to the judgment of so learned and experienced a person, as the justly-celebrated author of the late version of *Isaiah*: yet, as I shall not presume to determine any thing, I will take the

p. 32. — Vis ei nomini subjecta (i. e. Judææ,)—pro ratione diversorum temporum, modo *latius*, modo *minus* late patet.

p. 31. See also p. 34.

* He thus relates the captivity of the ten tribes of *Israel* by the Assyrians. Σαλμανασαρης δ' ὁ τῶν Ασσυρίων βασιλεὺς—τὴν Ἰσραηλιτῶν ἡγεμονίαν ἀρδὴν ἤφανισεν, καὶ πάντα τοὺς λαοὺς μετῴκεισιν εἰς τὴν Μεδίαν καὶ Περσίδα. Antiq. Jud. l. ix. c. 14. See also l. viii. c. 8.

† When he speaks of the Babylonish captivity, he says, “Nebuzaradan carried away captive the nation of the *Jews*.” Λιχμαλωτίσας τοὺς τῶν ἸΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ λαόν. L. x. c. 9. See likewise l. viii. c. 12, l. xi. c. 1, and c. 5. sect. 17.

‡ Isaiah, c. xiv. ver. 24, 25,

liberty

liberty to submit my notions to the reader. The Assyrians and Babylonians are in this chapter supposed by Mr. Gibbon to be *one* and the *same* people. But to my humble apprehension they appear to be quite otherwise.

It is to be observed, that as the chapters in the Bible are now divided, many articles are brought together, as relating to the same history, and as being of the same tendency, which are found upon inquiry to be quite independent; and to have no relation. Thus in the fourteenth chapter of *Isaiab* there is a denunciation of God's vengeance against *Babylon* described at large; and the final destruction of that city foretold, with all the particular circumstances of its ruin, which we know to have been wonderfully fulfilled: and the people of that great empire are supposed to be mentioned both under the title of *Babylonians* and *Assyrians*. Hence it is presumed, that the Babylonians and the Assyrians were the *same* people. But to me, both in this passage, and in all others, they appear to have been described as essentially different: for however they may be in this instance commemorated *together*, yet there seem to be two distinct prophecies the one *subsequent* to the other, and the prophet speaks of two different people. This will appear plainly to any person, who, after this intimation, will attentively consider the different parts of this chapter*. The first contains a prophecy against the Babylonians; which is very pointed and determinate; and concludes with the utter ruin of their city; which was to be rendered a pool of water; and to be

* In this xvth chapter are three prophecies; the first against the Babylonians; the second against the Assyrians; and the third, an obscure one, against the people of Palæstina, or Philistim.

uninhabited

uninhabited for ever. “ *For I will make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water : and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts **.” Here we find an utter end of the city as well as of the people. The prophecy must necessarily finish here ; as there is nothing more to be said. That which follows, though supposed to be connected, has in reality no relation to the prophecy which preceded. It begins with this exordium.—*The Lord of hosts hath sworn : surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass : and as I have purposed, so shall it stand : that I will break the ASSYRIAN in my land ; and upon my mountains tread him under foot. Then shall his yoke depart from off them ; and his burden depart from off their shoulders †*. Now let me ask, When was it that the *Babylonian* was thus demolished in the sacred land ; and trod under foot in the mountains of Judah ? Nothing of this sort ever happened. But the *Assyrian* was thus trampled down and broken ; and the prophecy relates to *Sennacherib*, and the downfall of the Assyrian empire : and particularly to the destruction of that prince’s army, when it was encamped before Libnah, in the hilly region of Judah. Here it was that one hundred fourscore and five thousand men of his numerous host were cut off in one night : and Hezekiah and his people freed from the *Assyrian* yoke : for most of the fenced cities before had been in subjection to the enemy ‡. Sennacherib upon this misfortune returned to Nineve, where he was soon after slain ; and the empire of Assyria ended in his successor Esar-Haddon, or Assar-

* C. xiv. ver. 23.

† Ver. 24, 25.

‡ 2 Kings c. xviii. 13. xix. 35.

Adon. The time of this prophecy is precisely determined by the words at the conclusion—" *In the year that King Abaz died, was this burden* *." This was about fifteen years before the ruin of the Assyrian army ; for in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, Sennacherib came up against Judah ; and Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz. From these histories it is manifest that *the Assyrians and Babylonians were not the same people*. Let me now ask Mr. Gibbon, if I have any need to apply the terms of *ignorance and inaccuracy* to the prophet Isaiah ?

It is moreover observable, that the Assyrians used to carry away the people whom they conquered, and to place colonies of different people in the vacated cities of each nation. After Samaria had been taken, the ten tribes were carried to Hala, Habor, and Haran ; and to the cities of the Medes. In their room were brought by the King of Assyria men from Ava, Cutha, Hamath, Sepharvaim ; also from Media and Elam. Among these we find mentioned men from *Babylonia* †. Now, when it is said, that the Assyrians brought *Babylonians*, are we to suppose that they brought *Assyrians* ? Certainly not ; yet Mr. Gibbon would persuade us, that they were the same people : And when it is said that the *Assyrians* conquered the *Babylonians*, can it be thought that the Assyrians defeated themselves ? All these instances of inconsistency he tries to evade, by endeavouring to qualify and moderate what he has said ; and by appealing to Grecian authority. But the whole is an obstinate mistake on his side ; and of such sort as shews, that he only skims the surface of History. As to Herodotus, Strabo, and the other

* Isaiah c. xiv. 28.

† 2 Kings c. xvii. 6. 24. xix. 11, 12.

Greek writers, they speak of nations and kingdoms as they were estimated in *their* time. We do the same ourselves; and include a vast country at this day under the name of Persia, quite up to Astrabad and Derbent, upon the Caspian sea. But were a person in speaking of ancient times to mention Ragau, or Egbatana, as Persian or even Assyrian cities, he would be very culpable. Judea has been at times stiled Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Idumea *; yet they were all distinct countries, and the people of those countries essentially different. But after all, Strabo, on whom Mr. Gibbonds so much, has nothing to his purpose; and he must have misunderstood him entirely. Strabo never says, that the Assyrians and Babylonians were the *same* people; he affords not the least colour for this notion. Nay, he intimates the very contrary. His account of Assyria begins with an enumeration of the various countries comprehended under that name †: καλεσι δ' οὕτω τῇ Βαβυλωνίῳ, καὶ πολλῇ τῆς κυκλῶ γῆς. *They speak of Babylonia under this name; and a large portion of country round about.* He proceeds to inform us afterwards, that Elymais, Dolomene, Chalachine, Apolloniatis, together with many of the Mesopotamian regions, were in like manner comprehended; and particularly those parts upon the Euphrates, which were occupied by the Arabians. Such is the account of this geographer. Are we from hence to suppose, that he would make the people of Elam, Arabia, &c. the same as the Assyrians? He has no such intention. He is only describing an extent of empire, which

* Vid. Selden. Syntagmata de Dis Syris in Prolegom. & Beyer. Additamenta, p. 6. Reland. de reb. Palæstin. in nomen Judææ.

† L. xvi. p. 1070.

went under one name. What his real opinion was of the genuine Assyrians, may be known from his determination of their country, when he comes to define it properly; and to describe its capital, Nineve. He says, that this city of Ninus was *in the region of Aturia*; which Aturia many with good reason have imagined to have been a mere variation of the term Assyria*. But where was this Aturia? He tells us; *Aturia borders upon the region about Arbela*†. And where was Arbela? He proceeds to tell us, that it belonged to Babylonia; consequently it was not a part of Assyria. But this is impossible, if Babylonia and Assyria were the same. The truth is, they were not the same; and it is plain from this city being thus adjudged to the one, and not to the other. They lay on different sides of the river; and the people were alike distinct and separated in the same manner. Our Historian would evade this matter; but I will keep him strictly to the point; and not afford him opportunity for any subterfuge. What will the reader say now to Mr. Gibbon's polite compliment, "If Mr. Davis were a man of learning, I might be morose enough to censure his ignorance of ancient geography, and to overwhelm him under a load of quotations,

* *Ατურια* and *Ατურια* were used for *Ασσυρία*, just as *τιτταρες* was for *τισσαρες*. Strabo indeed mentions the same region by both names; though he rather gives the name of *Ασσυρία* to the whole empire in its widest extent; and appropriates *Ατურια* to the ancient and original province of Assur. That *Aturia* was the same as the ancient Assyria, is plain to a demonstration. For the ancient and true Assyria was the province of which Nineve (called Assur at this day) was the capital. But so was *Aturia*. *Ατურια εστιν εν ηπερ η Νινος—Νινος πολις—εν πιδω κυμνη της Ατურιας.*—Strabo, l. xvi. p. 1070, 1.—Therefore *Aturia* and *Assuria*, however expressed, are the same.

† *Η δε Ατურια τοις περι Αρβηλα τοποις εστιν ομοια* (read *ομορα*).

“ which

“ which might be collected and transcribed with
“ very little trouble ?”

But as my adversary has most obligingly appealed to Herodotus, in accommodation to my capacity, “ as he *must* suppose that I have received
“ a classical education :” it would be very unkind not to attend to his proof, that Babylon was the capital of Assyria *.

True it was ; but at what time does the historian say, it became the capital of Assyria ? not till after the destruction of Nineve. Now this event happened ante C. 612 †, but the Israelites were made captives by the Assyrians several years before that period. Mr. Gibbon therefore has not gained a step by this authority, unless it would prove Babylon to be the metropolis, when the ten tribes were carried into captivity.

Besides, he should have fairly told us, that Herodotus calls the inhabitants of this *Assyrian* metropolis *Chaldeans* (οἱ χαλδαῖοι ‡), and that in other places he makes a distinction in the clearest terms between the Assyrians and Babylonians. After speaking of the revolt of the Medes, under Deioces, from the Assyrians, he says, “ And in this
“ manner the Medes preserved their empire, and
“ recovered their former dominions ; took Nine-
“ ve ; and made the *Assyrians* subject to them ;
“ except the province of *Babylon* §.”

This event took place in the reign of Cyaxares, Phraortes being slain at the siege of Nineve ; at which period, a distinct person, Nabopolassar, who

* Vind. p. 21.

† See Prideaux and Usher.

‡ Clio, c. 182, 183.

§ Καὶ ὅτω ἀνίσωσαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν Μῆδοι, καὶ ἐπικράτειον τῆς περὶ καὶ προτέρου. καὶ τήντε Νινὴν ἴλον—καὶ τῆς ΑΣΣΥΡΙΟΥΣ ὑποχείριως ἐποίησαντο, πλὴν τῆς ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝΙΑΣ μοίρας. C. x. 6.
had

had also rebelled against the King of *Affyria*, was King of *Babylon*; and therefore his province was not touched by the Medes. So that Herodotus does not justify this indiscriminate use of the words *Affyrian* and *Babylonian*.

Had I not produced the evidences already collected, I might have put the issue of the contest on a single text; as there is one the most plain, and the most convincing, that can be desired. It is in a prophecy of Jeremiah, where the king of *Babylon* is expressly opposed to the king of *Affyria*; and the land of one to the land of the other. In consequence of which, both the country and the people are manifestly distinguished. The prophet is speaking of the enemies of Israel, and of God's judgments upon them. "*Israel is a scattered sheep: the lions have driven him away: first the king of ASSYRIA hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadnezzar king of BABYLON hath broken his bones. Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold I will punish the king of Babylon, and his land; as I have punished the king of Affyria*.*" What do the notions of the Greeks and Romans, taken collectively, amount to, when opposed to this positive and precise evidence? In short, an *Affyrian* king is never mentioned as a *Babylonian*. The last of that empire was Assar-Adon; and though he had possession of *Babylon*, yet he is never stiled king of it; on the contrary, a proper distinction is always maintained. For when it is said that his officers took Manasseh, and carried him bound to *Babylon*, they are stiled the officers of the king of *Affyria*; though it is certain, that the city abovementioned was then in

* Jeremiah, c. l. v. 17, 18.

his

his hands *. Now Assar-Adon † was the king who was discomfited by Pharaoh Necho at Carchemish; and this is the last time that we hear any thing of a king of Assyria ‡. For Nineve was soon after ruined by the Medes, and Nebuchadnezzar set up for himself at Babylon; as Berodach Baladan || had done before him, but with better success §. From this time forward we read only of kings of Babylon. To finish the whole of this argument, I beg to lay down this as a test, that in the Scriptures you will never hear of Assyrians from Babylon, nor of Babylonians from Nineve ††.

It

* 2 Chron. c. xxxiii. v. 11.

† Sir Isaac Newton, and after him the writers of the Universal History, make Sarac, or Assaradon the second, to be the king who lost Carchemish to Neco, and in whom the Assyrian name ended. Before him, and after the great Assaradon, they place Saosduchius and Chyniladon, from Ptolemy's canon.—The latter of these they suppose to be the Nabuchodonosor of the book of Judith. But, at any rate, it appears that the king, who lost Carchemish, was the last of the Assyrian name.

‡ Sir John Marsham corroborates this assertion in his Chronicon :

Postquam Babylonii per annos octo sine rege vixissent, deficiente forsan stirpe regia. Rex hic, (Asar-haddon) ea opportunitate fretus, Babylonem occupat, & utrumque *Assyriorum* regnum (quod a Nabonassari tempore duplex fuerat) in unum redigit. Post hanc regnorum conjunctionem, evanuit *Assyriaci*, increbuit *Babylonici* nominis gloria adeo ut Rex hic *Assyriorum* ultimus sit in S. literis celebratus; ejusque successores *Babylonii* nuncupentur. Ipse autem tam *Assyriae*, quam *Babyloniae* Rex agnoscitur. Chron. p. 514. 4^o ed. Franeg. 1696. See Prideaux's Connections, vol. i. p. 151. Usher's Annals, ante C. 610.

|| Some express this name otherwise. It probably was *Merodach Baladan*.

§ 2 Kings, c. xxiii. v. 19. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. x. c. 2. § 2.

†† The learned Beyer, in his additions to Selden's Syntagma, mentions an ingenious conjecture, which he recommends

It follows therefore that the *Jews* were never under the *Affyrian* yoke, much less did they languish for many ages. But we are, in the next place to consider what reason our Historian has for calling them *the most despised portion of their slaves* *.

These are hard terms, and he strains every nerve, to blacken the character of the Jews, and to make them both hateful and contemptible :

commends from Martin and Scaliger, as “ an useful and excellent method of distinguishing the *Chaldean* or *Babylonian* from the *Affyrian* kings, by reducing their names to the simple words.”——

“ Huc referre non ineptum erit, quod *Martinus* in Lexico “ habet de his et aliis Deorum regumque nominibus, et simplicibus et compositis, occasione *Nebuchadnezzaris* regis “ *Babylonis* fere ex *Scaligero*, quem citat, ita vero ille.”—*Nebuchadnezzar* rex *Babylonis*, qui *Beroso*, *Ναβυχοδονοσορος*.

Vox est composita ex *בב* quod et *בב* et *בב* et *בבב* quod et *בבב* et *בבב* quæ sunt inter nomina simplicia propria ; quorum catalogum habes apud *Scaligerum* Lib. 6. de. *Emendat. Temp.* ubi monet horum et similibus nominum methodum utilissimam esse, et maximè necessariam Chronologo, saltem ut ne Reges *Affyrios* cum *Chaldeis* confundat.

I shall take some instances from each.

Nomina propria *Chaldeorum*.

1. Nebo, Lebo. 2. Nego. 3. Neror. 4. Scheschach.
5. Meschach. 7. Letzar. 8. Netzar. 11. Belti. 12. Adam.
16. Bel. 20. Dach. 24. Chad.

Affyriorum.

1. Schadran. 2. Schalman. 3. Teg lith. 5. Haddan.
6. Neschroch. 8. Etzar vel Atzar. 9. Asar. 10. Ballat.
11. Ofen vel Ofn. 13. Sen. 14. Pul.

Now, as he observes, these were chiefly names of *Chaldean* Gods or idols, and were adopted by their Princes and great men ; we can easily distinguish the Kings of *Affyria* and their servants, from the Kings of *Babylon*. *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Nabopolassar*, and *Nebuzaradan*, are particular instances of *Chaldean* names, specified by this learned critic. See *Beyer Additamenta ad Seldeni Syntagmata*, p. 332, 333.

* History, p. 451.

as if this would at all affect the worship which they maintained, or the religion which was subsequent to it. It is a stale trick, and unworthy a person of our Author's parts and learning, to have deviated into a path, which has been so often beaten: especially by Tindall and Bolingbroke: by Voltaire and Du Pauw.

To confute in the most evident manner this malignant assertion, I shall give

AN EPITOME OF THE JEWISH HISTORY,
*During their Captivity under the Assyrians,
 Medes, and Persians.*

As Mr. Gibbon says, " If he had designed to investigate the Jewish antiquities, reason, as well as faith, must have directed his enquiries to the sacred books * : " he cannot object to my having so closely followed the holy Scriptures. The Jews by their obstinacy and rebellion had brought upon themselves the fierce anger of the king of Babylon: and upon their city being taken, a great number of them suffered without mercy. Yet as soon as the first impulse of anger was over, no captives were better esteemed, or more honoured. So that what ensued was quite contrary to every article, which the malignity of our Historian would insinuate. The very first order concerning them proves, how superior their nation must have been to others, from the deference, which was shewn to them in the same circumstances. *And the king (Nebuchadnezzar) spake unto Ashpenar, the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the prince's children, in whom there was no blemish; but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom,*

* Vind. p. 29.

and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science; and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, &c."* We here see the persons, whom our author would depreciate, selected by their bitter enemy for their worth, excellence, and skill in science; and destined immediately to the highest honours of his court. And for what reason were they thus distinguished above others? I have just said, that it was on account of their personal accomplishments, as well as for the endowments of their minds. And of this the king could not have had any experience: the whole must necessarily have arisen from the general character of the people for learning and wisdom. Daniel, who was very young at this time, was particularly favoured: and at last came to be made governor of the province of Babylon, and was also by the prince raised to be head of the Magi†. Many others among the Jews were held in great honour: nor is there the least reason to think, but that the whole of the nation was in repute and favour. Azariah, one of Daniel's friends, was promoted to a place of eminence under him in the province of Babylonia. Such posts in the very heart of the kingdom shew, what great trust was reposed in them. Who would think that such exalted characters could have been so shamefully traduced? Evil-merodach, the king of Babylon, conferred great honour upon "Jehoiachin, king of Judah," lifted him up out of prison, spake kindly to him, "and set his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon‡" In the reign

* Daniel, c. i. v. 3. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. x. c. 10. ed. Havercamp.

† Ibid. c. ii. v. 48.

‡ 2 Kings, c. xxv. 27—30. Joseph. Antiq. l. x. c. 11. sect. 2.

of

of Belshazzar *, Daniel does not seem to have been in the same repute. Of this one reason probably was, his prophecy concerning the fate of the empire; which he more than once foretold would be ruined, and transferred to other people. However such was his reputation, that the king sends for him at an exigency: and though there were some fatal truths disclosed by him, yet he is revered greatly; and the King shews him every mark of honour. Not one syllable have we yet of hardships, contempt, and ignominy: nor is there the least tendency to annihilation. We come now to Darius the Mede, who had made himself king of Babylon. This prince appointed an hundred and twenty satraps to preside over the different provinces of his empire; which shews its vast extent. Over these were three presidents of a superior order; of whom Daniel was the first †. The Jews of the captivity could not be in a very wretched state, while they had some of their brethren in so high departments. The history concludes with an account of the permanency of these honours: “*So* this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and of Cyrus the Persian ‡.” Besides these, *Nehemiah* was cup-bearer to Artaxerxes, “*a* place of great honour and advantage,” says Prideaux §: And *Ezra*, was held in great esteem ||.—But I need not urge the example of *for-*

* Authors are divided as to Belshazzar being the son of Nebuchadnezzar. The generality make him the grandson, in compliance with the Prophets, Is. xiv. 22. Jer. xxvii. 7. Sir Isaac Newton supposes him to be the son, on the authority of Daniel, v. 2. where he is expressly so called, and also in Baruch i. 11, 12.

† Daniel, c. vi. 1, 2. Joseph. Antiq. l. x. c. 11. sect. 4, 5.

‡ Ibid. c. vi. 28.

§ Connections, vol. i. p. 288. Nehemiah, c. ii. 1.

|| Ezra, c. viii. ver. 21. 24, 25.

fortunate individuals, as they are called : the favours conferred on the nation in general will fully establish my point.

Let us now turn our eyes to the history of *Esther* : which gives us, we are told, “ a very extraordinary instance of the degree of estimation “ in which the Jews were held at Susa *.” *Esther* seems to have been a woman of extraordinary endowments ; and was on that account raised to be queen by Ahasuerus. In her time a horrid conspiracy was formed against the Jews : in which their enemies had purposed at one stroke, to have cut off all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus. Haman, the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, consequently a determined enemy to all of the Israelitish name, had been raised to great honours by the king. By the liberty granted him of having continual access to his presence, he sought an opportunity of carrying into execution his cruel design of extirpating the whole Jewish nation, for the offence of one individual. “ He thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone ; for they had shewed him the people of Mordecai †.” *And Haman said unto the king, there is a people scattered abroad, and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of thy kingdom : and their laws are divers from all people : neither keep they the king’s laws. Therefore it is not for the king’s profit to suffer them. If it please the king ; let it be written, that they be destroyed : and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver to the hands of those, who have the charge of the business, to bring it into the king’s treasury ‡.*” The king assented : and orders were dispatched into every province :

* Vind. p. 24.

† *Esther*, c. iii. 6.

‡ *Ibid.* ver. 8, 9.

and

and without doubt secretly, that upon a certain day the Jews should be set upon ; and all of them put to death *.

Mr. Gibbon exults on this occasion, and says with a sneer, “ this trifling favour was asked by “ the minister, and granted by the monarch, with “ an easy indifference, which expressed their con- “ tempt for the lives and fortunes of the Jews †.” But the Historian should have considered how many parts of this fact make against his intention of proving the despicable state of the Jews. Prideaux tells us this *Abasuerus* was the same as *Artaxerxes*, “ who shewed extraordinary favour and kindness “ to the Jews, beyond all the other kings that “ reigned in *Persia* ‡.” But he was prevailed on by the artifices of his favourite minister, to give up in a most barbarous and cruel manner a whole innocent nation as a sacrifice to the resentment of Haman.

Le Clerc, *Grotius*, and other commentators, shew that this is not the only instance of inhumanity upon record, wherein the punishment incurred by one person was extended to his relations or people §. Modern times exhibit a dreadful parallel, in the inhuman massacre of the Protestants at Paris, permitted and encouraged by Charles the Ninth, at the instigation of the queen-mother Catherine de Me-

* The weakness and inhumanity of the king is strongly pointed out by *Le Clerc*: he imputes it to a more probable cause than *a contempt for the Jews*, namely, the despotic sway of a Persian monarch, and the abject condition of his people in general (not of the Jews *alone*), who were looked upon as slaves, and their lives esteemed of little value.—“ *Feræ hæc erant, non hominis, &c.*” *Comment. in Est. c. iii. 11. and c. viii. 1.*

† *Vind. p. 25.*

‡ *Connections, Vol. i. p. 200. 244.*

§ *Clerici. Comment. in Est. c. iii. ver. 6. 11. Grotius in lib. Est. c. iii. 13.*

dicis, and by her influence with his ministry. Here we see a whole sect devoted for the offence of one man, and thirty thousand Protestants sacrificed to satiate her resentment. And the irresolute monarch is forced to suffer the barbarous plot to be executed *.

Surely Mr. G. cannot speak of these unhappy victims as being previously in a despicable state? or call it "*A trifling favour, expressing contempt for their lives and fortunes*," because it was granted "by the Monarch when asked by the Queen and ministers."—But to return—

We may infer from the sequel, that the persons

* Thuanus, or Le Thou, thus speaks of the fact: and as his impartiality is commended by Mr. Gibbon (Vind. p. 123.) his relation will be the more satisfactory.

"Ibi tunc ultimo consultatur de rei exequendæ ratione: —et quando unius hominis morte, quem ex vulnere convalescentem jam medici affirmabant, regni malum quod ab illo alatur, & in multos diffundatur, extingui non potuit, placuit ut universum exitio opprimeretur, & ira quam Colini folius sanguine expleri noluit Deus in sectarios omnes effunderetur:—Itaque de Protestantibus ad internecionem plane delendis assensere omnes, &c.

Regina media jam nocte, verita, ne Rex, quem ad facinoris atrocitatem adhuc fluctuantem & nutantem sibi animadvertere videbatur, mutaret, in ejus cubiculum descendit —Ibi hæsitantem Regem—a matre increpitum memorant, qui tam pulchram a Deo oblatam debellandorum plane hostium occasionem cunctatione elabi sibi sineret. Thuani Hist. tom. iii. lib. lii. c. 6. ed. Buckley, 1733.

Voltaire, in his *Henriade*, thus speaks of the ascendancy of the imperious Catherine over Charles:

"Charles plus jeune encore avoit le nom du Roi.

"MEDICIS regnoit seule, on trembloit sur sa loi. &c.

* * * * *

"Elle arma le courroux de deux sectes rivales.

And again,

"Le peuple dont la reine avoit armé le bras,

"Ouvrit enfin ses yeux & vit ses attentats."

Henriade. chant. ii. p. 34. chant. iii. 8vo ed. à Lond. 1728.

to whom the business was chiefly delegated, were their old enemies, those of the nations bordering upon the land of Israel ; who were now in the same state of captivity ; and scattered over the king's dominions. The sacred writers often introduce great events single and unsupported ; leaving out many of the leading and explanatory circumstances ; as being well known in the times when they wrote. This renders some of the histories difficult to be understood. But the Scriptures are of a texture so curious, that what does not at first appear, may generally be discovered by collation. And it is wonderful how much hidden knowledge may be obtained by considering the context, and observing the tendency of the whole. This design against the Jews, was undoubtedly carried on privately, as appears by the queen having never been apprised of it. But secret as it may have been kept *, it was

* It is not of any consequence, in respect to the present purpose, whether these designs against the Jews were openly published to all the world, or *carried on in secret*. But as the clearing up of this article will afford light to many other parts of the history, it may be attended with some good effects, should this matter be rightly stated. For there is a seeming obscurity and embarrassment in the narration, of which *Monf. de Voltaire* has availed himself, in order to depreciate the whole, and, if possible to render it absurd and incredible. As far as I can judge, the designs against the Jews were never known to this people, till *Mordecai* by some means *perceived* them, and apprised his brethren of their danger. It is very plain, that the queen knew nothing of the matter ; and it is hardly probable, when such a cruel scheme was formed, that it should be published at large to all the world ; and that the very people should be beforehand certified of it, whose lives and fortunes were sought after : and this too almost a year before the execution. Yet the words of the historian seem very determinate, and may be thought too cogent to admit of any limitation : for it is said, that the letters of the king upon this occasion were sent in the first month *into every province, to the lieutenants, governors,*

was providentially discovered to Mordecai, her father's brother, by whom, after the death of her parents,

governors, and rulers of every people, according to their language; &c.—The copy of the writing was published to all people, that they should be ready against the day. (C. iii. v. 12. 14.) But by all people, here mentioned, we must necessarily understand, all those whom it might at that time concern: those only who were the avowed enemies of the Jews: for the people alluded to, who had the edict particularly directed to them, were those who were to be ready against the day. They were the persons in every province, to whom the executive part of the business had been delegated by Haman; and who were to be the instruments of his malice. As to the first part of the king's letters, wherein the lieutenants, governors, and rulers are mentioned; and the king's orders are specified so minutely, the whole seems to be a mere matter of form; and was probably the usual tenour of all such royal declarations. We find afterwards, when other letters of a different purport were written in favour of the Jews, the preamble was nearly the same. It was written to the Jews: and to the lieutenants, and deputies, and rulers of the provinces, which are from India to Ethiopia—unto every province according to the writing thereof, and unto every people according to their language, &c. (C. viii. v. 9.) This was the tenour of the ordinance: and yet the business was secret. And mention is made at the conclusion, that the copy of the writing for a commandment to be given in every province was published to all people. (C. viii. v. 13.) By this, surely, is meant, to all people whom it might concern; and for whom the letters were designed; and not to all in general: for the enemies of the Jews knew nothing of these orders; and it is plainly intimated, that on the very day when the insurrection happened, the enemies of the Jews hoped to have surprised them; but they were disappointed, and were themselves set upon, and destroyed. If then the orders were secret in the latter instance, we may be assured, that they were so in the former. It is indeed said, when the king and Haman seemed satisfied, and sat down to regale themselves, after the decree was issued, that the city Shushan was perplexed. (C. iii. v. 15.) But this concern could not be general; all that we can suppose to be intimated by these words is, that there was perplexity in the city Shushan. There was an apparent uneasiness among those who were privy to the decree; and who disapproved of the king's injustice. I have mentioned that the queen

rents, she had been brought up. He found means to give her intimations concerning this design : and she

queen was not apprised of this design ; nor was it known to her servants ; nor even to the chief officer, who waited upon her : and Mordecai, who had discovered the horrid scheme, throughout the whole of his correspondence addresses the queen as a person to whom it was entirely a secret. In his message to her he describes the conspiracy at large, and sends her a copy of the decree ; and at the same time lets her know her own danger, as well as that of her friends. In consequence of this the queen was greatly alarmed, and took in hand the deliverance of the Jewish nation. It is indeed previously said, that *in every province, wheresoever the king's commandment and his decree came, there was great mourning among the Jews, &c.—and many lay in sackcloth and ashes.* (C. iv. v. 3.) Hence we might be induced to imagine, that the Jews, from the very first, were acquainted with the king's purpose. But it was not so ; and we are plainly told, that this alarm, and mourning, were subsequent to the discovery. *When Mordecai perceived all that was done ;* (C. iv. v. 1.) that is, after that he had providentially discovered all, that was purposed against his nation ; and had gotten a copy of the very decree : then (v. 3.) *in every province whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came,* (or rather had come) *there was great mourning among the Jews : then many lay in sackcloth and ashes.* For we may well imagine, that as soon as the discovery was made, intelligence was forthwith sent ; and the Jews were informed of their danger. But when did this happen that *Mordecai perceived all that was done* ? The investigation of this point is of consequence ; as the whole will be confirmed by it ; and I think the time may be with a tolerable degree of accuracy determined. As soon as he had discovered the plot of Haman, and had obtained a copy of the decree, he put on mourning, and stood before the gate of the palace. (C. iv. v. 1.) When the queen was informed of this, she sent an officer to him to ask the reason of his appearing in this manner ; and the cause was forthwith made known unto her. She upon this enjoins Mordecai and his friends to fast and to pray for three days ; and promises that she will herself, with her whole household, do the same. This being performed, upon the *third day* (exclusive) *she put on her royal apparel,* and stood before the king. (C. v. v. 1.) And having obtained a gracious reception, she begs his company on the morrow to a banquet, which she had provided,

she was necessarily alarmed to a great degree. By her address she in good time gained access to the king: and, as her purpose could not be effected in a short space, she invited him for two days successively to a banquet, which she had at her own cost provided. In this interval she informed him, that Haman was a traitor: and that the Jews did not deserve the severity, which the king had been induced to denounce against them. She then informed him of a circumstance, which she had ne-

provided, and which was to last two days. (C. v. ver. 2. 8.) The whole of the time seems to be *six* days inclusive. On the last of these days Haman's treachery was discovered; and he was degraded and put to death. *On that day did king Abasuerus give the house of Haman, the Jews enemy, to Esther.* (C. viii. v. 1.) And the queen took that opportunity to beg of him to reverse his decree against the Jews. *Then were the king's scribes called at that time, in the third month (that is the month Sivan) on the three and twentieth day thereof; and it was written according to all that Mordecai commanded, unto the Jews, and to the lieutenants, and the deputies, and the rulers of the provinces, &c.* (C. viii. v. 9.) We find, that the interval from Mordecai's being apprised of the design of Haman to the 23d of Sivan, amounts only to *seven* days; so that he obtained his first intelligence upon the 16th, or, at the soonest, upon the 15th of that month. But the first decree against the Jews was passed upon the 13th of the first month; from which, to the 15th of Sivan, were two months and two days. During this term the design was manifestly kept secret; and it would have been thus preserved to the very time of execution, had it not been by some means *providentially* discovered. I have mentioned before, that there can be no doubt about the fact. For a festival is still kept up: and there has been an uniform commemoration annually preserved from the very day of this great deliverance. Yet some persons, from a seeming embarrassment in respect to order and time, have been led to arraign the account given, as inconsistent and improbable. But upon inquiry it is found a regular and consistent history, and, in all respects, agreeable to truth. And the whole of it does honour to the Jewish nation, which, even in captivity, was respectable; and triumphed over all its enemies.

ver

ver mentioned before ; that she was *herself* of
Jewish race : that it was her own nation, and the
 house of her fathers, which had been doomed to
 utter ruin. About this time a fortunate circum-
 stance had happened, which must have led the
 king to a more favourable opinion of this people.
 As the prince was one night restless, and could
 not compose himself to sleep, he ordered the book
 of records, wherein all the occurrences of his
 reign were written, to be read to him for his
 amusement. In this book there was mention made
 of a conspiracy formed by two of the great officers
 of state ; which had been discovered by Mordecai ;
 by whose means the king's life was preserved.
 Though this service was of the highest consequence,
 yet the person, by whom it was effected, does not
 seem to have solicited any reward, either in per-
 son ; or by means of the queen, with whom he
 must necessarily have had great interest. Howe-
 ver the King, upon having this history read to
 him, recollected how much he had been indebted
 to him ; and at last made him suitable returns, by
 raising him to the greatest honours. And the
 treachery of Haman being proved, he was de-
 graded from his high rank, and hanged upon the
 very gallows which he had prepared for Mordecai.
 As the king's eyes were now opened, the queen
 begged of him to reverse his decree against the
 Jews ; and not suffer such a cruel edict to be put
 in execution. The king seems to have been very
 much embarrassed about remedying this evil : for
 he perceived, that he had been greatly misled.
 He accordingly sent for his scribes, by which are
 meant the chief persons of the law ; and all that
 they could advise, was, to send notice to the Jews
 to be upon their guard upon the 13th of the
 month Adar. A permit was likewise granted
 I them,

them, to be beforehand with their enemies, by falling upon them first ; and thus to prevent their designs. It may be asked, Why did not the King countermand what he had ordered, and make void his decree ? It certainly was not in his power : and from hence proceeded his embarrassment. For the laws of the Medes and Persians could not be altered *. And it is said in the chapter, where this history is recorded,—*The writing which was written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, might no man reverse* †. The only way therefore, which could possibly be devised for the preservation of the Jews, was to let them have secret notice of all that was designed against them : and to give them leave to make use of the intelligence, and to be beforehand with their enemies. They accordingly were not remiss : but bestirred themselves in good time : and *smote all their enemies with the stroke of the sword :—and did what they would to those who hated them* ‡. It is plain therefore, contrary to Mr. Gibbon's assertion, that “ a legal defence was allowed to this submissive people, and their resistance not only dreaded, but severely felt. And so great was the fear of the Jews upon the people of the land, that many became proselytes to their religion §. We find that in all the provinces there are some particular people mentioned as enemies : even *in the palace of Shushan, they slew five hundred men* ||. Who were these men ; and who were those in other places thus slain by the Jews ? Not Medes, nor Persians, we may be assured ; nor Babylonians : for *all the rulers of the*

* Daniel, c. vi. 8.

† Esther, c. viii. 8.

‡ C. ix. v. 5.

§ C. viii. v. 17. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 6.

|| C. ix. v. 6.

provinces,

provinces, and the lieutenants, and the deputies, and officers of the king, helped the Jews *. They would not have afforded this assistance so universally against their own nation, and their own families. These enemies of the Jews were the Amalekites, Edomites, Moabites, Philistines, and other nations in captivity. From this we may infer, how deep the scheme was laid: and at the same time, in what estimation the Jews were held. For they were in every place assisted by the natives; who seem to have held in abhorrence the treachery, which had been conceived against them. I cannot help thinking, that the 83d Psalm was composed upon this occasion: though it is mentioned as a Psalm of Asaph. It is a noble composition; and particularly adapted to the circumstances of this history. *Keep not thou silence, O God: for lo, thine enemies make a tumult: and they that hate thee have lift up their head. They have taken crafty counsel against thy people, and consulted against thy hidden ones †. They have said, Come, and let us cut them off from being a nation: that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance. For they have consulted together with one consent: they are confederate against thee. The tabernacles of Edom, and the Ishmaelites: of Moab and the Hagarenes. Gebal and Amalek: the Philistines and those of Tyre. Assur also is joined with them: they have holpen the children of Lot.* I know no time when Assur can be supposed to have been confederate with the Tyrians, Philistines, Amalekites, Ammonites, and the other people specified, except the time here mentioned: when they were all in the same state of captivity.

* C. ix. v. 3.

† תְּסִיֵּא *thy secreted people.*

With

With this season the confederacy agrees very well.

The history of Esther has been greatly misunderstood : and grievously perverted : but when properly considered ; it is found to be of much consequence : and places the Jewish nation, even during their captivity, in a very favourable light. It is said of this people, that when they put their enemies to death, *they laid not their hand on the spoil* *, though it was permitted them to take it. They left it probably for the king : and thereby shewed that they did not act upon mercenary views ; but merely to secure their own lives and properties. The spoil of the Jews had been granted to Haman, if his design had succeeded : and he seems to have accepted of it. Hence we may infer, that when he promised the king ten thousand talents of silver, that they were to have arisen from spoil and confiscation : so that the Jews could not have been in a state of indigence and servility. It is remarkable, that when the queen expostulates with the king in favour of her people, she tells him—*We are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be slain, and to perish. But if we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I had held my tongue* †. There is nothing here, nor in any history extant, which can induce us to believe, that the Jews were *the vilest portion of slaves* : on the contrary, it is past contradiction manifest that they were not in a state of slavery : but as free as other people ; and held in equal honour.

How great this deliverance was, as well as how certain the history, may be known from the feast of Purim, which was instituted in commemoration

* C. ix. v. 10.

† C. vii. ver. 4.

of it; which is still annually kept up. We read in the second book of Maccabees*, that Judas having obtained a great victory over Nicanor, they ordained it should be commemorated upon the 13th of Adar, *the day before the feast of Mordecai*. This proves both the antiquity of the feast of Purim, and the reception of the history on which it was founded. It is so named from a kind of divination by fire; to which Haman had recourse in order to know the success of his machinations. We may presume that he had proper assurances; but his dæmon deceived him at the close, and gave him over to ignominy and ruin.

It is natural to enquire, what great and powerful cause produced this wonderful and extraordinary change in affairs? "The beauty of Esther," says our philosophic historian: "*had ESTHER been less lovely, or less beloved, a single day would have consummated the universal slaughter of a submissive people*†," &c.

If his producing this instance as a proof of the despicable state of the Jews, was surprising, much more so is the turn of his comment! How constantly does he keep in view his favourite hypothesis of resolving the exertions and interpositions of Providence into secondary causes! With this it suits well to ascribe the preservation of the Jews to the beauty of Esther, and her influence with Ahasuerus. I can compare his reflection to nothing but the licentious, though juvenile, expression of the poet,

A wife! ah, gentle Deities! can he
That has a wife e'er feel adversity?

* * * * *

* Ch. xv. v. 37. See also Esther, c. ix. v. 20—28.

† Vind. p. 25.

“ At Hester’s suit the persecuting sword
 “ Was sheath’d, and Israel liv’d to bless the Lord*.”

That Esther’s beauty influenced Ahasuerus, and consequently made him favourable to her petition, cannot be doubted; but did not Mordecai point out the real cause, when he told her *who* “ knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this; intimating, that “ God raised her up to the dignity in which she “ was, on purpose that she might be the deliverer “ of her people †.” In short, *Reason* as well as *Faith*, to whose dictates Mr. Gibbon now and then affects to attend, might have prevailed on him to impute the amazing change to the *providence* of the God of Israel, who, in order to preserve his favoured people from the destruction threatened by the treacherous artifices of the cruel Haman, changed the heart of the weak king, and raised up *Esther* and Mordecai as powerful advocates to rescue the Jews, and avenge them of their enemies.

Neither the Jews, nor Esther herself, relied on the power of her charms; and what is remarkable, she did not think herself in favour at that time, “ having not been called to come in unto the “ king for thirty days ‡:” but she and the *Jews* fasted and “ offered up prayer and humble sup-
 “ plication to God to prosper her in her undertak-
 “ ing.”

I cannot close this wonderful history better than

* Pope’s January and May.

† Esther. c. iv. 14. and Patrick’s exposition.

‡ Esther, c. iv. 11. 16. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 6. sect. 7, 8. In the decree of Artaxerxes, which Josephus gives us, we find it entirely attributed to the operation of God. Τὸ παρὰ φόβου τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ ταύτην αὐτὴ τὴν δίκην ἐπιβαλόντος— ταύτην γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὁ ΘΕΟΣ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ληθρίας, σωτηρίαν πεποιήκειν.— l. xi. c. 6. sect 12. Ed. Hudson. Oxon.

in

in the pious reflection which we read in Bishop Patrick's Comment, who, with other Expositors*, attributes the whole to *the special providence of God.*

“ In this wonderful deliverance of the *Jewish* nation there was no extraordinary manifestation of God's power, no particular cause or agent, that was in it's working advanced above the ordinary pitch of nature; and yet the contrivance or suiting of those ordinary agents appointed by God, is more admirable than if the same end had been effected by means truly miraculous†.

Our Historian asserts likewise, that “ the books “ of *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* do not afford a very “ pleasing view of the situation of the Jews under “ the *Persian* empire ‡.” I am sorry to say, that Mr. Gibbon does not seem to be very conversant in the sacred writings, however versed he may be in profane history.

For, one of the most interesting circumstances relating to the state of the Jews in captivity, is the event with which the history of *Ezra* commences.—He informs us, that in the first year of Cyrus, King of Persia, a proclamation was made throughout all the kingdom; wherein full leave was given to the Jews to return to Jerusalem; and to rebuild their temple. The words of this edict are remarkable—*Thus saith Cyrus, King of Persia: The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth: and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah.*

* Prideaux's Connection, vol. i. p. 244—250. See Patrick's Comment. on Esther, ch. ii. 17. iii. 7. vi. 1, &c.

† Reflections on Esther, c. vii. See the remainder of this admirable passage.

‡ Vind. p. 24.

We find here much matter comprised in small compass: and the whole is of great importance. We learn that in the very first year of the king's reign; before, one would imagine, the great affairs of his empire could be well settled, he turns his thoughts to the Jews, and to their concerns. *Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin: and the Priests and the Levites, with all them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord, which is in Jerusalem* *. This was an arduous undertaking; and very expensive: what means had they, which could make them expect, that they should be able to carry it into execution? We are told that they were in no wise destitute, for they set out *with vessels of silver, with gold, with goods, and with beasts, and with precious things: besides all that was willingly offered* †. In this account we find not the least sign, that the Jews had been in a low, abject, and ignominious state: on the contrary, if we may judge by these tokens, they seem to have enjoyed a great share of freedom, affluence, and security. But our Historian asserts, that “the nation (of the Jews) “seemed to be *dissolved*, or *annihilated*, by the “hardships and oppressions, they suffered ‡.” This could not have been the case; for if it had, the people of the Jews would no longer have remained distinct, but themselves and their names would have been lost, and mixed with the inhabitants of the land: yet we know they did separate from them, and many returned to Jerusalem. Can he produce a single instance of the hardships under which they are said to be oppres-

* Ezra, c. i. v. 5. See also 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20—23.

† Ver. 6.

‡ Vind. p. 23.

sed,

fed, with which the other captive nations were not affected? How then can they be called the *most despised* portion of their slaves? Nay, on the contrary, they suffered less than Moab, Ammon, Edom, Amalek, Palestine, Damascus, Hamath. These nations were carried into captivity, and not one of them was reinstated.—But, continues he, “the band of exiles who returned to inhabit the land of their fathers was inconsiderable*.” Very true; and therefore I concluded before in my *Examination*, that “*those who staid behind must have been in a state of free service †.*” Nor is the opinion singular; the learned Dean *Prideaux* draws a similar conclusion. “It is most certain, that notwithstanding the several decrees that had been granted by the kings of *Persia* for the return of the *Jews* into their own land, there were a great many that waved taking the advantage of them, and continued still in *Chaldea* and *Assyria*, and other Eastern provinces, where they had been carried, and it is most likely that they were of *the best and richest* of the nation that did so. For when they had gotten *houses and lands in those parts*, it cannot be supposed that such would be very forward to leave *good settlements*, to new plant a country that had lain many years desolate. But of what sort soever they were, it is certain a great many staid behind, and never returned again into their own country. And if we may guess at their number from the family of *Aaron*, they must have been many more than those who settled again in *Judea ‡.*”—These inferences are very different from those of Mr. G.; and yet are they drawn

* Vind. p. 23.

† Exam. p. 3.

‡ *Prideaux's Connect.* vol. i. p. 108, fol. ed. Lond. 1717.

from the same premises. We see the Dean supposes many of them to be in a rich and flourishing condition, enjoying houses, lands, and good settlements *.

Besides

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* l. xi. c. 1, says, πολλοὶ δὲ κατεμείναν ἐν τῇ Βαβυλωνίᾳ, τὰ κτήματα καταλίποντες ἢ θέλοντες.

Dean *Prideaux* here follows the opinion which is grounded on the positive testimony of *Josephus*; that the ten tribes even in his days remained in immense numbers beyond the Euphrates. But I shall lay before my reader substantial reasons for supposing the authority to be insufficient.

Josephus says, Ὁ δὲ πᾶς λαὸς τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν κατὰ χώραν ἔμεινε. δύο καὶ δύο φυλάς ἵνα συμβέηκεν ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀσίας καὶ τῇ Εὐρώπῃς Ῥωμαίοις ὑπακούσας. Αἱ δὲ δέκα φυλαὶ πέραν εἰσὶν ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἕως ἄντρος μὲν τρία ἄνδρες ἀπείροι καὶ ἀριθμῶ ἴσως ὅθι μὴ ἀνυμνεῖται. *Antiq. Jud.* l. xi. c. 5. sect. 2.

And *Ammianus Marcellinus* tells us, that “when Julian” marched towards Babylonia, he found upon the Euphrates “a large city whose inhabitants were Jews.” L. xxiv. c. 4.

Let us now follow the thread of his history, and see if this can be reconciled with his own narration.

In consequence of the decree of Cyrus, the main body of the *Jewish* nation, among whom, it is probable, were many of the *Israelites*, carried away by the first *Assyrian* conquerors, returned to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel.—The like was the case in the subsequent returns under Esdras and Nehemiah.—And so all became in country and government united with the joint tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

The expeditions of Darius, and afterwards of Xerxes, into Europe, might be the means of bringing back still more of the *Israelites* from the eastern provinces.—In the time of Alexander, we know there were still Jews or *Israelites* resident in Babylon and Media; for their brethren at Jerusalem petitioned the Macedonian that the privileges he had granted to themselves might be extended to them also. *Joseph. Ant.* l. xi. c. 5. sub finem.

The favour, however, which this prince, and some of his successors, in Egypt and Syria, afterwards shewed to this nation, and the great confidence they were wont to place in them, would naturally induce many more to leave the remote parts of the empire. *Ibid.* l. xii. c. 1. 3. Compare also *Joseph. contra Apion.* l. ii. sect. 4, 5.

Antiochus

Besides these instances of private wealth, the king restores to the Jews all the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away. These were very numerous and costly ; such as few kingdoms at the time could have furnished : and no other

Antiochus M. in particular, summoned two thousand families from Babylon and Mesopotamia, granting them dwellings and lands in Asia, with many other advantages. L. xii. c. 3. sect. 4.

Seleucus Nicator first granted them settlements in his new cities. L. xii. c. 3. See also Universal History, vol. iii. p. 518. 544. fol. ed.

These causes were sufficient to bring back the greater part of the *Israelites*, who, coming by degrees, would be united in every respect with those originally established by the decrees of Cyrus and Artaxerxes. And if any remained behind, it is probable they were so few as to be swallowed up by the heathen nations ; and lose all memory of their religion and origin. Thus Asia, Europe, and Lybia came to swarm with such multitudes of Jews ; and the distinction of their tribes to be little noticed.—And it can hardly be credited, that in the time of Josephus a great nation of *ISRAELITES*, infinite in numbers, were known to inhabit beyond the *Euphrates*.—That country was then well known ; and traversed afterwards as late as the time of Trajan—yet are no where traces to be found of such a people. And in these modern days of commerce, and curious enquiry of every sort, that country has been long frequented by Europeans, and a particular search made for such a people—yet none are found either there or any where else on the face of the earth.

We have every reason, therefore, to believe that the dispersed Jews now subsisting are the descendants of those who, after the decline of the Greek empire, became subject to the Romans ; and comprehend individuals of every tribe, as well as of Judah and Benjamin :—though the name of *Israelites* was lost ; and all were known by the general denomination of Jews. And this opinion seems most conformable to the several prophecies respecting the dispersion, and the future union and restoration of this people.

I cannot therefore help suspecting, that the words 'ΑΙ ΔΕ ΔΕΚΑ ΦΥΑΑΙ, &c. to ΔΥΝΑΜΕΝΑΙ, are not originally the words of *Josephus*, but the marginal note of some Jewish or Christian reader, after the growth of that error, foisted into the text.

prince would have restored ; for those of gold and silver are said to have been in number no less than five thousand four hundred. With this accumulation of wealth the Jews returned to their own country. But whence did it proceed, that they were so highly favoured ? and how came they, above all other conquered nations, to be entitled to this particular enlargement ? It was partly on account of the known worth and excellence of the Jewish nation ; but it was more particularly effected in consequence of the many predictions, which their prophets had at times disclosed ; and which the events had wonderfully confirmed. Ezra mentions very truly the prophecies of Jeremiah. But those, which must have wrought most with Cyrus, were the predictions of Isaiah. They are particularly alluded to in the words of Cyrus, when he says, “ *God hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah **.” This prophet had also foretold, more fully than any other, the downfall of the Babylonish empire ; and not only mentions its ruin ; but tells by whom, and in what manner, it was to be brought about. He speaks of the Persians as the future subverters of that monarchy ; when there is reason to think, that the existence of the people was scarcely known in Judea. He addresses himself to *Cyrus* by name, above an hundred years before the birth of that prince ; and points out in what manner he should take the city ; mentioning that *the river* should be made *dry* for the passage of his army ; and *the gates of brass* should not withstand his power. All which we know from the Grecian writers to have been literally accomplished. It was also said, that by his means the temple at Jerusalem should be

* Ezra, c. i. ver. 2.

restored.

restored. When therefore he had taken Babylon, and was in possession of the whole empire, how great must have been his astonishment, when he found every thing which he had accomplished so precisely and determinately foretold? And in all this there could be no room for any deceit: for there must have been copies of these prophetic writings in most parts of the kingdom; and innumerable vouchers to prove the authenticity of these oracles. There had been prophecies about the Assyrians, and the ruin of their state; and the Babylonians were conscious of the same evils being predicted against them; and by these nations many truths could be ascertained. They had experienced the completion of many of these predictions; and their authority was too convincing to leave any doubt. Hence it was, that Cyrus, in his very first year, amidst all his public concerns, thought nothing of more consequence than his making a proper return to the divine power, which had manifested itself so plainly in his favour. He made a proclamation, wherein he gave leave to all the Jews, who should choose it, to return to their country, and rebuild their temple. At the same time he made them those noble presents above mentioned—promises, in his decree, to discharge himself the expence of the building—grants them the same honours which their ancestors enjoyed—allows them a supply from the tributes of Samaria, and threatens those who disobey these commands with confiscation and death*; and ordered all his officers in the western parts of his dominion to assist the Jews towards the accomplishing of their

* Την δε εις ταυτα δαπανην, εκ τε εμαυτη γενεσθαι βυλομαι—συγχωρω δε αυτοις και την εκ προγονων ειδισμενην τιμην—κελευω δε την τουτων χορηγίαν εκ των της Σαμαρειας γενεσθαι φορων. κ. τ. λ. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. i.

great

great purpose. Had he delayed his orders to the tenth, twelfth, or any subsequent year, people might surmise, that the prophecies were of later date; and made after the event: but the early date of the proclamation leaves not any room for such contrivance. Indeed it was morally impossible for the Jews, so circumstanced as we know them to have been, to have carried any such design into execution: for the natives would have detected and exposed them. The prophecies were certainly true, and well authenticated; the consequences with which they were attended shew it. For nothing but mere predictions could have certified that they were the people of God; and that the divine power still interested itself in their favour. There is otherwise no accounting for the particular notice taken of them above other people; nor for their final return: a blessing, to which the rest of the captivated nations were never, that we know of, entitled. The same indulgences which they had received from Cyrus, they experienced from other princes. Darius, in the second year of his reign, not only confirmed the decree of Cyrus, in favour of the Jews, but enlarged it greatly, and surpassed him in kindness:—"He gave the Jews
 " a certificate of their liberty, forbade his officers
 " to exact tribute of them, made their country
 " free, commanded the Idumeans, Samaritans,
 " and the inhabitants of Cœlo-Syria, to leave the
 " Jewish towns, which they possessed, and to con-
 " tribute 500 talents towards building the tem-
 " ple *:" and his decree expresses *"that of the
 " king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the ri-
 " ver, forthwith expences be given unto these men,*

* Παντας εγραψεν ελευθερος ειναι τες εις την Ιουδαιαν των αιχμα-
 λωτων απελθοντας, κ. τ. λ. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 3.
 sect. 8.

“ for the building of this house of God, that they
 “ be not hindered :” he threatens their enemies
 “ with death, and grants them the free exercise of
 “ their religion *.”

In the reign of Artaxerxes, Ezra was commissioned by the king and his counsellors, to go up to Jerusalem, accompanied by those of his countrymen who were thus minded, to enquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem : and to carry the silver and the gold which the king and his counsellors have *freely offered* unto the God of Israel—with orders to receive from the king’s treasure-house whatever more should be needful—his treasurers were to answer Ezra’s requests, to a certain measure—and they were not to impose tribute or custom on the priests, Levites, or other ministers of the house of God †. And afterwards, when the Jews were oppressed by their enemies, and their city injured : this same *Artaxerxes* issued out a decree for the rebuilding of the city, and appointed *Nebemiah* governor, sent a guard with him, and letters to the king’s governors to assist him with supplies and prosecute the work ‡.

“ The books therefore of *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*
 “ afford a *very pleasing view* of the situation of the
 “ Jews under *some* of the *Persian* emperors ;” as
 well as an unpleasing view of the oppressions and injuries they sustained from others. Thus the temple was rebuilt, the city reinstated, and the Jewish polity restored. In the prosecution of these designs, they

* Ezra, c. vi. ver 7—12. Prideaux’s Connections, vol. i. p. 153.

† Ezra, c. vii. viii. In Josephus he is called Xerxes. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 5. See Prideaux, vol. i. p. 182. 205. 254. &c.

‡ Nehemiah, c. i. ii. &c. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xi. c. 5. sect. 6, &c. Prideaux, part i. book 6.

were

were undoubtedly impeded by their enemies, who were averse to their establishment and increase *. And from whence did this ill will proceed? Was it from contempt, and disdain: because they had been a low and servile people? No: by no means: it was because they had been a great, and respectable nation: and were dreaded even in ruin. The very reason given at one time for stopping their progress is said to be, because—*there have been mighty kings over Jerusalem, which have ruled over all the countries beyond the river: and toll, tribute, and custom was paid unto them* †. They are the words of Artaxerxes: whose jealousy had been raised from a consideration of what this people had been, and from a fear of their future greatness.

From the whole then we may observe, that the very arguments which our author advances, in his *Vindication*, to confirm his former assertion, that “the Jews were the most despised portion of slaves,” destroy his general design.

He does however so far favour them, as to allow that they *emerged from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander*.

How constantly does he describe every circumstance relative to this extraordinary people to their disadvantage, when he could fairly place them in a more favourable light! He speaks of their obscurity in such an absolute, yet indeterminate, manner, that one would imagine they had been at all times a low and ignoble people. But in reality they were never in a state of obscurity from the

* The decree of *Cyrus* was in some measure obstructed in its intent by the enemies of the Jews, who bribed the king's ministers. And in the reign of *Cambyses*, the building of the temple and city was totally impeded. Joseph. Antiq. l. xi. c. 2. Prideaux's Connect. vol. i. p. 127. 145.

† Ezra, c. iv. ver. 20.

beginning,

beginning, no not even the Patriarchs before them, from whom they were descended. Though they were only sojourners in a foreign land, yet respect and reverence followed them wherever they pitched their tents; even kings and princes sued for their benediction and favour: so that in their state of pilgrimage they exhibited more genuine and native magnificence than Solomon in all his glory. Their descendants became a very numerous and a very respectable people; and few kingdoms could vie with that which they possessed. Though our author has said, that *they singly refused to join in the common intercourse of mankind*; we know it was their fault to mix too much with their idolatrous neighbours, and to copy their worship and their vices. It had been happy for them, if they had never *embraced*, or even *respected the superstitions* of the world; but had *singly opposed* themselves to the temptation. They were too yielding, and fell accordingly; and for their punishment were carried into captivity. But even in this state they were more respected than any people upon record in the like circumstances. They were at last permitted to return, and soon recovered their former greatness; which our author is pleased to describe, as *emerging from their obscurity*. He moreover says, that *it was under the successors of Alexander*. But what does it signify at what period it happened? the wonder is that it was ever effected. The *Assyrians, Medes, and Babylonians* were ruined; but they never recovered themselves. The nations also which were neighbours to the Jews, suffered in the same manner, and nearly at the same time, that they did; but they never came back, and their name scarcely survived in history. The same may be said of the *Tyrians, Sidonians, Egyptians, Macedonians, and*
I
Carthaginians,

Carthaginians, who were all in their time conquered and brought to ruin ; but were never reinstated. As our Historian so often draws a parallel to the disadvantage of the Jews, he should for once make a comparison in their favour. It may possibly be said, that here they stand *single* ; and it must be confessed that they do : in this part of their history, as well as in many others, the hand of Providence is very visible ; and therefore it does not become an impartial writer to omit a circumstance so interesting and of such consequence.

As the emerging of the Jews from obscurity had been referred by Mr. Gibbon to the *successors of Alexander*, it was observed by me, in my *Examination*, that “ the Jews never found any more “ bitter enemies than *some* of these kings *.” So far from being of any advantage, they injured the Jewish nation, and impeded its increase. Some of them invaded their country ; others, who were more friendly, engaged them, as allies, in war, which was a circumstance nearly as fatal. Others draughted away the best of the nation for colonies, and carried them into different parts. Mr. Gibbon being pressed with these arguments very wisely alters his whole order of battle. He accordingly tells us, his meaning was, that the honour and repute of the Jews, and their state, arose from *these numerous colonies*. Those who were carried away, were *fixed by the kings of Asia and Egypt, in Antioch, Alexandria, &c. who placed them ισοπολιτας, ισοτιμους, in the same honourable condition as the Greeks and Macedonians themselves*. I observed also before, that “ Ptolemy the son of Lagus at “ one sweep carried off an hundred thousand of

* Exam. p. 4-

“ the

“ the inhabitants of Judea ; of which thirty thousand were chosen persons, whom he forced to serve in his armies †.” Yet I never thought that this could have been any benefit to the country, or to the Jews in general : for at this rate we must suppose, that to impoverish a land is the only way to improve it ; and that to drain a person’s best blood, and lop off a limb or two, is the only way to give him health and spirits. But it is in vain to contend on this matter with Mr. Gibbon, as our ideas of cruelty and calamities are so widely different. He can calmly speak of the taking away captive ten thousand of the inhabitants of Judea, and the demolishing of their metropolis, as “ *the transient ravages* of an advancing or retreating enemy, who led away a multitude of captives ‡.” But, he pleasantly tells us, that the Jews in these settlements got a *knowledge of the world* || ; and were besides held in equal honour with the natives ; and that this countenances all he said in the passage about their *emerging*, &c. We, to be sure, may infer from this circumstance, that wherever they came, they were respected above other foreigners, and could not be that base and ignoble people which he has elsewhere represented them. But to imagine that the reputation of the Jewish people was owing to these exiles, is an idle and preposterous surmise. The honour and grandeur of the nation arose from the dignity of the priesthood, the magnificence of the temple, the sumptuousness of their other buildings, the populous-

† Exam. p. 4.

‡ Vind. p. 26.

|| Mr. G. says, in his History, “ A larger acquaintance with mankind extended their knowledge without correcting their prejudices,” &c. p. 453. c. xv.

ness

ness and wealth of the country, and the respect paid to the princes and nobility of the land. As to the colonies at *Antioch* and other places, how little do we know of them? Let them have been ever so honourably received, they added little to the lustre of the Jewish state; but served only to drain and impoverish what they are supposed to have upheld. They got, it seems, a *knowledge of the world*; but I believe (like our modern adepts in this science) they paid very dearly for it; and that the regard shewed to them was not always of long duration. At *Alexandria*, though they might not be treated as *the vilest portion of slaves*, yet they were insulted, robbed, plundered; and great numbers of them racked, imprisoned, burnt alive, crucified, and otherwise put to death; all which added little to the credit of the nation §. But be their treatment as it may, what is it to the purpose of our Historian? How can he be so disingenuous as to avail himself of such a poor subterfuge? How can he assure us, when he is speaking in general of the Jewish nation *emerging from obscurity*, that he refers to its colonies, and to *their being introduced to the knowledge of the world*? His original meaning is plain, whatever gloss he may put upon it.

It may not perhaps be necessary to dispute what he says about the Jews in the next sentence:—*And as they multiplied to a surprising degree in the East, and afterwards in the West, they soon excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations.* There is however nothing of this sort, that I know of, upon record; and the whole seems to have been only a vague sentiment, sported occasionally. Had any such curiosity prevailed, we might expect that a

§ Philo adversus Flaccum.

diligent

diligent enquiry would have been the consequence ; whereby this people would have been well known ; and their history better ascertained by the Pagan writers. We should not then have been told, that the Jews were from Crete, and denominated from Mount Ida ; that they were led to their place of settlement by Judas and Hierosolymus ; and that they were the same people as the Idæi Dactyli ; the same also as the Solymi of Lycia, mentioned by Homer : that they were six days in travelling to their place of settlement ; and that they got possession of it upon the seventh ; which was on that account held sacred ; or else because there are seven planets *. That they were the children of Semiramis, and came originally from Thebes, being led from thence by Bacchus, whom they particularly worshipped. That they also worshipped an ass, an hog, and the clouds ; or, as others maintained, that they payed their adoration to *nothing*. Lastly, that the head of an ass was found in their temple. These and many other idle notions were entertained about this people, which do not seem to have taken their rise from *curiosity* and *wonder*, but from indifference and neglect.

This however is of little consequence, in comparison with what Mr. Gibbon advances, in disrespect to their law and their manners. *The sullen obstinacy*, says he, *with which they maintained their peculiar rites and unsocial manners, seemed to mark them out as a distinct species of men.*

These are severe allegations, which he has heightened with greatest acrimony, in order to depreciate the Jewish people. We know nothing

* See Tacitus, Hist. l. xv. also Dio ; Justin ; and Steph. Byzantinus, &c.

of this *fullen obstinacy*, which is here laid to their charge, nor is this accusation authorised by history. They had their peculiar rites, which were very significant, and of great consequence; however idle and ridiculous our author may suppose them. They were enjoined them by the God whom they worshipped; and they were commanded never to depart from them. They accordingly did abide by them; and in this observance what *fulleness* or *obstinacy* did they betray, more than people of other countries, who conformed to the religion of their fathers? The more pure their religion, the more were they justified in adhering to it. The Jews admitted no image of the Deity; they abstained from the flesh of particular animals; they performed uniform ablutions; and maintained other rites: but these were observed more or less by other nations; by the Gaditani; by the Egyptians; by the Samanæi of Bactria; by the Hylobii, Brachmans, and Gymnosophists of India; by the Druids and Saronidæ in Gaul; and by the disciples of Pythagoras*. All these adhered to particular rites, some of which were similar to those of the Jews; yet who ever imputed to them either fulleness or obstinacy? But Mr. Gibbon takes great pleasure in representing things in an unfavourable light: he accordingly observes, that they were so determined in their received opinions, that Antiochus could not by any means bring them off from their religious attachments; and yet he made use of no small *violence* †. But what was it that this king so earnestly

* I mention these because they had no image in their temple. See Silius Italicus.

† “ Neither the *violence* of Antiochus,” says Mr. Gibbon, “ nor

nestly required? Among other things, that they would feed upon the flesh of swine; which their soul abhorred. On this account great numbers were put to death; and among the rest seven brothers, with their mother, underwent the most cruel tortures. Now this abstinence, exclusive of its being a divine ordinance, was perfectly innocent*; nor could Antiochus in particular, nor the Syrians in general, be at all affected by it. Why might not the Jews abstain from swine's flesh, as well as the Pythagoreans from beans, the Egyptians from the flesh of sundry animals, the Brachmans from all flesh whatever? Yet this fierce and merciless tyrant, contrary to all equity and humanity, would force it upon them; and they with the greatest constancy refused it. They died in consequence of their perseverance; and there were others to a large amount put to the most cruel kinds of death, because they would not violate the divine law. All this, which any unprejudiced person would have esteemed magnanimity and fortitude, is by our author stiled *obstinacy and sullenness*†. He does indeed go so far as to allow that Antiochus, this most detestable example of inhumanity, “*adopted new maxims of tyranny*.” Surely this is a very gentle mode of expressing his barbarous cruelties; but as the objects of his vengeance were the *despicable Jews*, our mild Historian views their sufferings with the same unfeeling indifference as

“nor the arts of Herod, nor the example of the circumja-
cent nations, could ever persuade the Jews to associate
with the institutions of Moses, the elegant mythology of
the Greeks.”—History, c. xv. p. 451.

* See a *Dissertation* by the learned Mr. Jones on the *Jewish distinction between clean and unclean animals*.

† The humane Pliny, in like manner, calls the perseverance of the Christians, *pervicacia & inflexibilis obstinatio*.

that in which he describes the horrid persecutions which the wretched Christians suffered ; and can, with equal grace, apologise for the violence of Antiochus, and the inhumanity of Maximin. What a pity it is that a person of his abilities and judgment should be guilty of such wilful misconception !

After all, what is it that the advocate of the Pagans could wish to have done ? How could the Jews have merited his approbation ? Why by relinquishing the worship of the *one true God* ; and going over to the polytheism and superstitions of the Heathen. This is plainly intimated. But to which party would he have had them join themselves ? For, as I before observed, there was no uniformity in the Pagan world ; and it may be difficult even for him to determine which religious order they ought to have made their option. Should they have betaken themselves to Moloch, or to Baal ; to Mithras or Ammon ; or to the Ape and Onions of Egypt ? I am afraid that Mr. Gibbon would have been very indifferent about the worship, if only a change had been made. If they had deserted the God of their fathers, and abused the religion in which they had been instituted, he would have esteemed them a complying and rational people ; of a liberal turn, and of a noble and enlarged disposition. As they hesitated, they are deemed *sullen* and *obstinate*, and condemned to infamy.

Nor is this language sufficiently harsh ; it is further said by our impartial Historian, that they *boldly professed, or faintly disguised, their implacable hatred to the rest of mankind*. That the Jews were not conformists with the world in general, in respect to religious worship, is past controversy true : but there were other sects and tribes,

tribes, and even whole nations, in the same predicament; none of which were on this account deemed culpable. On the contrary, they are often spoken of with admiration for persevering in their abstinence and purity; and for a fixed attachment to their religious duties. In other respects we have no reason to think that the Jews were enemies to society: we know that they got access into various regions in the Roman empire; and even in some countries beyond it. Now does it not seem a paradox, that people of so unfociable a turn should thus covet to mix with different nations; nations with which they could not originally have had the least connexion or acquaintance? As they are said to have *hated* these nations, they must have been reciprocally *detested by them*; all which heightens the paradox; for how they could have maintained themselves in such an hostile situation? How can we account for people unnecessarily bringing themselves into such a disagreeable state of life, when they had a country of their own, where they might have resided at their ease, and prosecuted their worship without the least molestation? In short, the whole that Mr. Gibbon brings upon this head is general invective: he follows his favourite Tacitus implicitly; who does not afford a single fact to support his own narration. There are writers who speak of them in a different light. It was long before the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, that the Jews betook themselves to the various regions which I mentioned above: had there existed among them any such sullen and unfociable disposition, attended with this *implacable hatred*, we should have had it authenticated by its effects. The consequences which would naturally have ensued, must have been animosities, seditions, treasons,

sons, bloodshed, with either banishment or extirpation; but we find nothing of this sort in any of the cities or states where they were dispersed. There were wars and tumults all over the world, from the time of Alexander to the reign of Augustus Cæsar: but in all these commotions and troubles the name of a Jew seldom occurs out of Judea. They do not seem to have had any share in the rise and fall of states; nor in the policies of the world. In all the countries through which they were scattered, they appear to have behaved peaceably and loyally; and with great prudence to have avoided both public and private feuds*. Though they were very numerous, we read not of any robbery, or act of violence; and seldom of any sedition laid to their charge; and though at times they were grievously persecuted, they do not seem to have shewn a persecuting spirit, not even in their own country: all the ill-will towards them was on account of their aversion to idolatry and Polytheism; and their not conforming to the worship of the people where they resided. When Apion was delegated to accuse the Jews before Caligula, the only accusation which he could bring, of any consequence, was, that they would not swear by the emperor's name, nor consecrate statues to his honour†. Their not being able to comply with these demands necessa-

* Josephus has recorded a particular instance of the respect the Jews met with from Augustus, and the influence they had with him.

"The Jews," says he, "being no longer able to endure the tyranny of Archelaus, accused him before Augustus; which they did with the more confidence, because they knew that the emperor had expressly commissioned him to govern his subjects with all manner of kindness and justice." Μη φοβόντες την ὀμότητα αὐτοῦ καὶ τυραννίδα, κ. τ. λ., Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. xvii. c. 15.

† Vid. Joseph. contra Apion. & Philo.

riyl

rily procured them many enemies. In other respects they seem to have kept up a friendly intercourse with the natives, and a correspondence with other people. The emperor Julian, in after times, intimates, that the Jews were industrious and good members of the community : and he tells us, what is remarkable, and equally true at this day, that no Jew was ever seen a beggar. He likewise adds, that they contributed largely towards the exigencies of the empire ; more indeed than was their share : from great part of which burden he thought proper to free them *. The account given of them by Porphyry is likewise very much in their favour ; and yet Porphyry was as staunch a Pagan as Tacitus †.

That this imputation of *universal hatred* cannot be true, may be in some degree shewn from their Law ; which enjoined love and charity to all. The inhabitants of Canaan, and the Amalekites ; were indeed doomed for proper reasons to the sword ; but good-will and loving-kindness were in every other respect enforced. The children of Israel of old had been basely treated by the Egyptians : yet they were told not to *abhor an Egyptian* : and after a particular time they might admit him to their worship ‡. In the same place it is said, *Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite* : yet the Edomites at a certain season had greatly distressed them. The like is intimated about Moab and Ammon. Their charity was to extend to their servants and slaves : who after a certain interval were to be set free. The slightest appearance of every thing cruel and unnatural was to be avoided. “ *They were not to* “ *seeth a kid in the mother’s milk : nor to muzzle* “ *the ox, which trod out the corn.*” Porphyry ob-

* Epist. xxv. and xlix.

† Vid. Περὶ ἀποχρῆς, l. v. p. 391—393.

‡ Deuteronomy, c. xxiii. v. 7.

serves, " that they would not hurt any animal, " which took shelter under their roof; though it " were allowed them to feed on it by their law. " They thought it cruel to take such an advantage *." In all the precepts, conferred upon them, goodness and wisdom were equally tempered. And though people do not always act up to the laws, by which they should be guided; yet we cannot suppose, that they would so far deviate from general love, as to devote themselves to *universal and implacable hatred* †.

The Jews esteemed their law as of divine original: and therefore could not be brought to give it up. They thought the happiness of man depended upon it: on which account they were very zealous in bringing people over to their own persuasion; and *compassed sea and land, heaven and earth, to make one proselyte* ‡. In this they might be too importunate and even troublesome: but it surely proceeded from good-will: and the desire to benefit others is incompatible with that malignity which has been imputed to them. They would never have persevered so universally in this friendly design, if they had shunned all intercourse with others, and been averse to social commerce. All that they avoided was the joining in the popular

* Περὶ ἀποχρῆς, l. v. p. 393.

† The reader who would see the *Excellency of the Jewish law fairly stated*, will consult, with pleasure and improvement, *two sermons* published by Dr. *Randolph*, on this occasion; and " *The Letters of certain Jews to M. de Voltaire.*"

‡ St. Matthew, xxiii. 15. I must beg leave to differ from Mr. Gibbon, who asserts, that " whenever the God of Israel " acquired any new votaries, he was much more indebted " to the inconstant humour of polytheism than to the active zeal of his missionaries."—History, p. 453.

It is hard to say whether he pays a greater compliment to the judgment and honesty of the Proselyte, or to the excellency of the Jewish law.

worship,

worship, and mixing in the affairs of state, and of the politicks of the people among whom they resided. They could not engage in any civil employments, nor accept offices of consequence, because they could not swear by the gods, nor be present at the solemn sacrifices. They did not partake of the public feasts, because *they could not eat any thing, which had been offered to idols*. They could not “in these instances comply with the fashion of their country, however *innocent and elegant* the practice,” may appear to our historian *. Nor did they frequent the public games; as they deemed such an intercourse a pollution. This is the whole of that supposed abhorrence: which they neither *boldly professed* nor *faintly disguised*; but calmly and conscientiously maintained, as they esteemed it their bounden duty.

Having closed my remarks upon the *Jews* and their *religion*, and vindicated them from the groundless aspersions of our Historian; I shall now briefly recapitulate what I have advanced.

I have shewn, that the *religious harmony* of the ancient world, so pompously described by Mr. Gibbon, in reality never existed;—that the Jews were not distinguished from other nations by an *intolerant* zeal:—that they were not subject to the *Assyrian* empire; for the Babylonian and Assyrian were not the same people:—nor did they languish for many ages under the Persian monarchy, *the most despised portion of their slaves*:—the malignant imputation of *sullen obstinacy*, and *implacable hatred* is confuted: and the excellency of the Jewish law fully displayed.

* The admirer of the Pagan mythology will see its beauties displayed by the pen of an engaging artist, in the iid and xvth chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History.

In

In the large view which I have taken, of the *Jewish* history, a person of less discernment than my opponent might possibly find *some* occasions for cavil and dispute. But, as my argument in the main is grounded on the truth of history, the reader will justify my assertion, That the representation of this people, of their laws and manners, as given by Mr. Gibbon, must be distorted, and false.—And, I will add, that unless he has been more fair and impartial in describing the state of the *Roman* nation and laws, he must disclaim for ever the lofty title of THE HISTORIAN OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. It still remains to take some notice of the other charge, which, in my *Examination*, I had alleged against my adversary; I mean that of

PLAGIARISM.

On this head I shall say but little, as Mr. Gibbon is forced to plead guilty to the charge; though he makes several efforts to evade its force.—He says, “according to the opinion which Mr. Davis “has conceived of literary property, to *agree* is “to *follow*, and to *follow* is to *steal* *.” Not so: there is an evident difference between introducing the same historical facts, and following the connection and thread of history marked out by another; between being impressed with a similar idea, and explaining it in the very same words. Mr. Gibbon himself is so free with others as to charge them with plagiarism if they merely concur in *idea* †. Besides, where the Plagiarist has had recourse to treatises written on *particular* subjects, he

* Vind. p. 81.

† See an instance in “*The Decline and Fall*,” &c. c. xiii. note 25. “The former *idea*, says Mr. G. he (Dr. Stukeley) “found in Richard of Cirencester:” and c. viii. note 43.

cannot prevent our tracing him out step by step. Of this Mr. G. seemed sensible, as he is obliged to make the following confession.

MOSHEIM and BEAUSOBRE.

“ If I touch upon the obscure and fanciful theology
“ of the Gnostics, I can accept without a blush the
“ assistance of the candid *Beausobre*; and when,
“ amidst the fury of contending parties, I trace
“ the progress of ecclesiastical dominion, I am not
“ ashamed to confess myself the grateful disciple
“ of the impartial *Mosheim*.

He himself here assigns his reasons for adopting so largely the sentiments of *Mosheim* and *Beausobre*: and, as I am not particular in my opinion, that he borrowed freely from *Barbeyrac* and *Middleton* *, it may be worth while to see what his motives might be for following *them* also.

BARBEYRAC.

As to the first, it admirably suited the purpose of Mr. Gibbon “ to copy the dark and dismal picture of the Fathers,” drawn by *Barbeyrac* in his *Traité de la morale des Peres*: for, “ it betrayed the pencil of an enemy †.”

DAILLE.

And though *Daillé*, being a generous adversary, did not afford him much abuse against the Fathers; yet as he is a rigid censor of them, he furnished Mr. G. with a few observations ‡.

* See Dr. Chelsum's Preface, and his Remarks, p. 67. Also, “ *A few Remarks*,” &c. by a Gentleman.

† Exam. p. 186. Decline and Fall, p. 514.

‡ Exam. p. 207.

MIDDLETON.

MIDDLETON.

When our Historian tells us, Dr. *Middleton* " *rose to the highest pitch of scepticism in any wise consistent with religion* " ; we cannot be at a loss one moment for the reason which induced him to extract so largely from this author, and to retail his objections so liberally : and that indeed not without a seeming excuse ; they were sentiments perfectly agreeing with his own. No doubt Dr. Middleton comes the nearest to Mr. Gibbon, they breathe as it were the same atmosphere ; though it must be allowed, that were we to fix Mr. Gibbon's station in the Theological Barometer, of which he has framed such a fanciful conceit, it would be, *the degree above the Doctor* ; for HE rises to a pitch of scepticism in *no wise* consistent with religion."

DODWELL.

Mr. *Dodwell*, is another author whom I have asserted, that Mr. Gibbon closely copied †. For this too we can easily account. For though Mr. Dodwell in most points is orthodox, yet his doctrine of *the small number of Martyrs*, coincided with Mr. G.'s view of contradicting the general belief, that an immense number of holy men lost their lives in the cause of Christianity ; and sealed their faith with their blood ‡. And there can hardly

* Vind. p. 83.

† Exam. p. 229.

‡ " To separate," says Mr. G. " a few authentic as well as interesting facts from an undigested mass of fiction and error, is the design of the present chapter." Again, " This probable and moderate computation may teach us to estimate

hardly be a more convincing proof of the reality and extent of this charge, than that I was able to point out from the *Cyprianic Dissertations*, in a great variety of instances, the very same facts, arranged in the very same order as in the History of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. To say, that this was the consequence of their having consulted the same originals, *Eusebius*, *Lactantius*, or the *Augustan history* *; is as absurd, as if an architect, who had planned one building upon the model of another, should assign as the cause of the similarity, that the materials of both were dug out of the same quarry.

HUME.

Nor can we wonder, that our author should coincide in sentiments with *David Hume*, which was observed by Dr. Chelsum †, since he introduces him as one of those few Historians who, “ since
“ the origin of theological factions—have deserved
“ the singular praise of holding the balance with a
“ steady and equal hand ‡.” After this observation,

“ estimate the number of primitive saints and martyrs, who
“ sacrificed their lives for the important purpose of intro-
“ ducing Christianity into the world.” “ *Decline and Fall*,”
c. xvi. p. 520. 585.

* Vind. p. 90.

† Remarks, p. 50.

‡ Vind. p. 123. I have pointed out a passage or two in the course of my *Reply*, which bear a striking resemblance; but if we were to compare the whole of Mr. GIBBON's lively description of the “ *True Genius of Polytheism*,” with Mr. HUME's *Natural History of Religion*; we should not hesitate long to determine whether our Historian, who deals only in Originals, made the antient Herodotus his model; or followed the modern philosopher, as affording the best commentary. See *Decline and Fall*, ch. ii. note 3, and the first part of chapters ii. xv. xvi.

we

we could not be surpris'd, if with equal modesty he had ranked *himself* in the number of those, who, " independent and unconnected, have contemplated with the same indifference, the opinions and interests of the contending parties; or, if they were seriously attached to a particular system, they were armed with a firm and moderate temper, which enabled them to suppress their affections, and to sacrifice their resentments."

It is pleasant to observe how Mr. Gibbon endeavours to reconcile his claim to *originality* with the confession which he is forced to make, of his being the transcriber of modern compilers.

" On these occasions, says he, what is the duty of a faithful historian, who derives from some modern writer the knowledge of some ancient testimony, which he is desirous of introducing into his own narrative? It is his duty, and it has been *MY* invariable practice, to consult the original; to study with attention the words, the design, the spirit, the context, the situation of the passage to which I had been referred; and, before I appropriated it to my own use, to justify my own declaration, that *I had carefully examined all the original materials* that could illustrate the subject which I had undertaken to treat *."

What a change is here in the stile of our author! How are his boasted claims sunk into nothing! When the Historian of the Roman Empire tells us *he has carefully examined all the original materials*; he means, (and it was rather necessary he should explain himself) that it has been *his invariable practice* humbly to consult modern writers; and when

* Vind. p. 86.

he had been directed to the sources of information which their margin afforded him, to *plume* himself with their erudition, while he carefully concealed his obligations, that *what he had transcribed from their quotations* might pass for his own discoveries. This is indeed an easy way of appearing learned ; but it has been in my power to shew the reader, and perhaps our Author himself is now convinced, that it is not always very safe. Let him therefore, for the future, be cautious how he adopts the sentiments of others, without inquiry, and remember the memorable lines of the poet ;

—“ *Miserum est aliorum incumbere famæ
“ Ne collapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis **.”

But, in answer to my proof of his having adopted this mode of compiling history, our author himself says, “ As I had frequently quoted “ *Eusebius, or Cyprian, or Tertullian,* because I “ had read them ; so, in this instance, I only made “ my reference to Tillemont, because I had *not* “ read, and did not possess the works of Athanasius †.”

This is a plain confession of the truth of my charge of plagiarism in one instance : and I have had occasion to take notice of several other such acknowledgements ‡ ; and shall now state one more.

Mr. Gibbon says, “ A rescript of Diocletian, “ which declared *the* old law—had been alleged by me on the respectable authority of Fra Paolo §.”

To a person who has read these words, and seen the proof I have given of his having erred in citing the *Theodosian Code*, in its very first page ;

* Juvenal Sat. viii. 76.

† Vind. p. 88.

‡ See the above *Reply*, and Vind. p. 53-75.

§ Vind p. 15.

it will not perhaps appear “ *bold in me, to conceive some hopes of persuading my readers, that an Historian who has employed several years of his life, and several hundred pages, on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire—* was forced to borrow, at second-hand his quotations from the Theodosian Code *.”

These inconsistent assertions are not however to be wondered at in our Historian.

“ *Tel est L'HOMME en effet, il va du blanc au noir,*

“ *Et condamne au matin ses sentimens du Soir.*”

“ But it is useful, continues Mr. G. to borrow the assistance of so many learned and ingenious men, who have viewed the first ages of the Church in every light, and from every situation. If we skilfully combine the passions and prejudices, the hostile motives and intentions of the several theologians, we may frequently extract knowledge from credulity, moderation from zeal, and impartial truth from the most disingenuous controversy †.”

It is very evident, of what great use the moderns were to him, and we still find him at his old work *of skilfully combining the human passions and prejudices* to draw out his philosophical conclusions: with what art and fidelity the design is executed we may be able to guess, after the instances which I have given of his quoting Tillemont as a modern directing him to the antients, and yet even misrepresenting Tillemont's account. But this, it seems, “ *is the honest and industrious manufacturer,*” who has fairly procured the raw materials, and

* Vind. p. 91.

† Ibid. p. 83.

“ worked

“ worked them up with a laudable degree of skill
 “ and success *.”

Some of my friends kindly pointed out to me the inadvertency which, in a few instances, I had been guilty of, in making Mr. Gibbon take the same passages from two different authors. I was led into it from a notion that he might have had both books before him at the same time, and transcribed in part from each. But this opportunity of attacking me in a vulnerable part was lost, either for want of sagacity, or through warmth of temper. But my adversary shall find me ever ready to give up an error, and, if it is in my power, to correct it.

And here, if it were necessary, I shall be screened by the example of a writer eminent for his critical abilities. My learned reader may recollect, that *Dr. Bentley*, in his *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, had represented more than one particular passage as transcribed by his opponent from two different authors †.

Mr. G. most shrewdly suspecting, “ from my
 “ name, that I am myself of *Cambrian* origin,
 “ concludes that my patriotism protected him
 “ from my zeal, in not censuring his comparison
 “ of Palestine to Wales §.” I shall first give him a more probable reason, which is, that I confined my remarks to his *fifteenth* and *sixteenth* chapters, in which this does not appear. And now in my turn I shall beg leave to suspect, that the *origin* of his *remark* respecting Palestine was from *Voltaire*, only changing the name from *Switzerland* to

* *Vind.* p. 82.

† *Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris*, p. 195. 211: 216. Lond. 1699.

§ *Vind.* p. 156.

Wales *. However, I will readily allow, that his opponents have forced him, in his *Vindication*, to consider the matter more minutely; and to transcribe from *Reland* the *ancient and weighty testimony of Jerom*, to make a figure with. But if Mr. G. ever condescended to look into the answers which were made to Voltaire, he might have seen the objection fully confuted in *the Jews letters*; wherein the causes of the *present* barrenness of Palestine are shewn; which did not exist when the Jews inhabited it. And as to it's being a mountainous country, proof is given, that even at this time, "the mountains in those countries supply the best pastures, and are preferred to the vallies †."

Now that I am speaking of Voltaire and "*the letters of certain Jews*" addressed to him, I should do injustice to my subject if I did not present to

* Voltaire says, "La Palestine n'était que ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui, le plus mauvais país de tous ceux qui sont habités dans l'Asie.—Elle est couverte presque partout de rochers arides, sur lesquels il n'y a pas une ligne de terre. Si cette petite province était cultivée, on pourrait la comparer à la Suisse."—"Il est vraisemblable que la Judée fut plus cultivée autrefois quand elle était possédée par les Juifs. Ils avaient été forcés de porter un peu de terre sur les rochers pour y planter des vignes, &c." *Essay sur l'Histoire Generale*, tom. i. p. 337.

Mr. Gibbon's words are "Palestine—was a territory scarcely superior to *Wales*, either in fertility or extent." (*Decline and Fall*, p. 15.) "The face of the country is covered with mountains, which appear for the most part as naked and barren rocks."

"These disadvantages, which now operate in their fullest extent, were formerly corrected by the labours of a numerous people.—The hills were clothed with rich beds of artificial mould—and almost every spot was *compelled* to yield some production for the use of the inhabitants." *Vind.* p. 154, 155.

† Letters of certain Jews to Mr. de Voltaire, vol. i. p. 382, 383. *Shaw's Travels*.

my reader's view the character of the French infidel as given in the above masterly performance: and it will appear, from drawing a parallel, that if Mr. Gibbon himself had sat for the picture, there could not have been a more striking likeness.

I.

Mr. Gibbon affects, upon all occasions, to have supported and justified his facts by great authorities; but I have shewn in my *Examination*, that oftentimes he either misunderstands or misrepresents them.

Let us now hear what the *Jews Letters* * say of *Voltaire*.

“ When a man wants to attack generally-received opinions, and that he has not good reasons to oppose, he strives to prop himself up cunningly, by great authorities: under the shelter of illustrious names, he runs less risque of exposing himself, and he seems to contend to greater advantage, at least for a certain time, and in the opinion of certain readers.”

“ We dare not say, that you never read the works of these learned men; but this we will venture to affirm, either that you have misunderstood the opinions of most of them, or misinterpreted them: at least, you do not speak of them with all that exactness which might be expected from such a writer as you †.”

Again, “ There are too many writers, Sir, who, in order to form an attack, or an apology to greater advantage, make false quotations without

* I have used the English translation of the *Jews Letters*, as more accommodated to my reader's use.

† *Letters of the Jews*, vol. i. p. 190.

scruple, alter the text *, or give it a false sense, and thus father arguments on authors which they never drew. Far be from us such odious practices, which are the feeble and scandalous resources of desperate causes, and capable of giving a bad opinion of the best †.”

II.

Mr. Gibbon's *loose manner of quotation* makes a capital article in my charge against him. In this how strikingly does he resemble his brother historian Voltaire ?

“ You certainly ought, for the instruction of your readers, to have named the *book and page*. You say somewhere that you do not like such exact quotations; you certainly have good grounds for your dislike; and yet such quotations are useful. It is true, that attention and labour are required to render them exact, and you have other things to mind besides comparing passages ‡.” — “ To quote in so vague a manner, is to tell the reader, search, if you chuse, and find if you can §.”

III.

It is plain, that Mr. Gibbon had other designs in writing the two last chapters, than merely “ to connect the progress of Christianity with the civil state and revolutions of the Roman Empire ||:” Voltaire's opponent in like manner taxes him with

* See *Traité sur la Tolerance*, c. xii. p. 105. 107. and *Letters of the Jews*, p. 288. 303, 304. vol. 1.

† Ibid. p. 78.

‡ Ibid. p. 211.

§ Ibid. p. 79.

|| Vind. p. 3.

having

having another end in view, besides that which he openly professes.

“ But whoever will read over your two chapters, with any degree of attention, will perceive, that besides the end which you openly profess, you have another in view, which though not less apparent, is not less real. You want to bring under this head, as well as you can, a heap of little cavils against our sacred writings, which you squeeze in right or wrong. As these small criticisms, collected out of Bolingbroke, Morgan, Tindal, &c. (who themselves borrowed these from others) are your chief study; we shall consider them with proper attention. As you are never weary of repeating them, we must not be weary of answering them*.

IV.

Mr. Gibbon, under the mask of a pretended reverence for religion, exposes its seeming imperfections. The comparison therefore which Voltaire's adversary draws between him and Shaftesbury, admirably suits our historian.

“ Shaftesbury, if we believe some of his learned countrymen, was an enemy of revelation, and the more dangerous because in his attacks he seems to profess respect. “ *He never attacks it face to face, or with serious arguments, but with rail-
“ lery and ironical reflections, which look as if
“ they fell by chance. He continually protests that
“ he firmly believes all the facts and doctrines which
“ are discovered by revelation. He is convinced that
“ our religion is divine, and our sacred writings in-
“ spired; that every human understanding should bow
“ down to them, and that none but libertines and pro-*

* Jews Letters, p. 238.

“*fane men could absolutely deny, or dispute the authority of a line, or a syllable in these holy books.*” This is a kind of attack which favours more of cunning than of candour, and more of stratagem, than of true learning. He followed the method of some unbelievers who went before him, and other modern free-thinkers like it so much, as you well know, Sir, that we meet it in every page of their writings. But these thread-bare stratagems, this old way of making war, cannot deceive any body now. The world is weary of seeing men fighting under a mask, and would think an open attack hereafter more honourable *.”

V.

Many proofs appear in my *Examination*, that Mr. Gibbon writes inconsistently, and advances contradictions: in this also he has formed himself upon the model of Voltaire.

“Perhaps we are mistaken, Sir,” say the Jews letters, “but the result of this comparison seems to be, that you have no fixed principles or determinate opinion on these matters at all, as is your case on many others. You agree with those writers in some places, and contradict them in others, nay you contradict yourself in the plainest manner, still shifting from one opinion to another, according as caprice or the prejudice of the moment hurries you away †.

VI.

I have shewn, to a great extent, how servile a Plagiarist Mr. Gibbon is; but perhaps neither he,

* Jews Letters, p. 205. See also p. 209, where the shameful mode of controversy adopted by *Collins* is exposed.

† Ibid. p. 109.

nor his admirers, will be much affected by this charge, as it makes him approach still nearer to his great original. "He, Voltaire, has collected all the antiquated objections of *Collins, Tindal, &c.* and *dressed them up anew* for the very same purpose for which they were first proposed. Indeed he seldom adds any thing from his own fund, and when he does, we have no reason to admire his learning or accuracy *."

"Mr. de Voltaire only repeats the English Deist's words. In these petty criticisms, he is so far from having the honour of invention, that he has not even that of applying them properly. Could he think that no one would ever read *Tindal*, or be acquainted with the learned answers given to him? What a part do these oracles of philosophy act, these mighty geniuses, who think themselves born to give light to the universe, when they become, every moment, the poor copies of a poor writer †!"

We have now seen how exactly Mr. Gibbon, and Mr. Voltaire agree as to their *mode* of writing, in *six* peculiar characteristics: we shall still add to the likeness, if we consider the general tendency and substance of their objections.

VII.

Mr. Gibbon has attacked the Jewish religion, in order to subvert it, as being the foundation of Christianity; and most shamefully misrepresents the state of the Jews, to make them appear vile and despicable.

So also, "Mr. de Voltaire," says his opponent, "has cast many cruel and ill-grounded aspersions on the Jewish nation and religion:—The

* Jews Letters, p. 5.

† Ibid. p. 294, and note.

“ real purpose of his attack seems to be the same
 “ of the Deists, to undermine the Christian reli-
 “ gion, by destroying the authority of the Old
 “ Testament, on which it is founded *.”

It is hard indeed to say, whether the language of Voltaire or of Mr. Gibbon, in treating of the Jewish nation and religion, is most severe : though their aspersions are equally groundless. They both speak of them as *bating*, and being in turn *bated by, the whole race of mankind, as the natural enemies of the human species* : and each of them most maliciously asserts that this mutual animosity arose from the unsocial spirit of their law and manners †.

Thus far the *Jews letters* have furnished materials for the parallel between Mr. Voltaire and Mr. Gibbon. Another striking feature or two, which may be traced in both, is well worthy our notice.

VIII.

Like our Historian, “ Mr. de Voltaire ascribed
 “ the cruel and bloody persecutions which the
 “ Christians endured under Nero, Domitian, De-
 “ cius, &c. &c. ‡ to their own intolerant zeal :”
 Mr. Gibbon stands forth the apologist of the Roman magistrates, and is bold to assert, that, as
 “ the rights of toleration were held by mutual
 “ indulgence : they were justly forfeited by a re-
 “ fusal of the accustomed tribute §.” And as
 Voltaire || owns that he was obliged to Mr.

* *Jews Letters*, p. 5.

† Compare Voltaire's expressions, *Additions à l'Hist. Gener. tom. viii. p. 174*, and p. 30 ; with Gibbon's words, *equally cruel and unjust, Decline and Fall, p. 453, 454.*

‡ *Letters of Jews*, p. 344, vol. i. Voltaire, *Traité sur la Tolerance*, c. vii. viii. p. 56—58. 68.

§ *Decline and Fall*, p. 521, &c.

|| *Traité sur la Tolerance*, c. ix. p. 68—70.

Dodwell's dissertation *on the small number of Martyrs* ; Mr. G. may think it less disgraceful that he has so largely borrowed from the same work.

IX.

To compleat the picture with a touch which will forcibly engage the reader's attention : Voltaire says, in his *Essay on General History* ; " nothing is more worthy our curious attention, than the manner in which it pleased God to establish his church, by the concurrence of *secondary causes* to promote the eternal decrees of his Providence *." How is the magnified importance of Mr. Gibbon's objections lowered, when his boasted discovery of philosophically accounting for *the establishment and progress of Christianity from secondary causes*, thus appears to be an argument which Voltaire had, before him, pressed into the service of infidelity !

Voltaire, like our Historian, wishes to persuade us that *toleration*, with regard to religion, universally prevailed under the mild genius of polytheism ; and that intolerance, with respect to worship, was peculiar to the Jewish law ; and religious wars known only among Christians †.

Let the reader judge then if I had not the strongest reason to assert, in my *Examination*, that " our modern pretenders to scepticism and infidelity, gain a name among some by retail-

* " Rien n'est plus digne de notre curiosité que la manière dont Dieu voulut que l'Eglise s'établît, en faisant concourir les causes secondes à ses décrets éternels. Laissons respectueusement ce qui est divin à ceux qui en sont les depositaires, & attachons nous à l'histoire." *Essai sur l'Hist. Gener. tom. i. p. 52.*

† Letters of Jews, p. 270, &c. *Decline and Fall*, ch. ii. and ch. xv.

" ing

“ ing objections which have been long ago started,
 “ and as long since refuted and exploded ; and
 “ that they adopt the same indefensible mode of
 “ supporting their attacks on Christianity.”

As Mr. Gibbon, perhaps with some reason, complains of the coarseness and harshness of my language, it affords me an opportunity of repeating my former caution—“ The artful insinuations of so agree-
 “ able a writer, imperceptibly seduce his readers ;
 “ who, charmed with his style, and deluded with
 “ the vain pomp of words, may be apt to pay
 “ too much regard to the pernicious sentiments
 “ which he means to convey †.”

A late ingenious publication ‡ has in some measure forestalled the animadversions which I purposed to make on that high colouring and false gloss with which Mr. G. states his facts, as best suits his bias and inclination §. “ He dwells,” says he, speaking of Mr. Gibbon, “ with visible
 “ pleasure upon the faults of the first professors
 “ of Christianity, *paints them in glowing and ani-*
 “ *mated colours*, exposes with a really ready, though
 “ affectedly reluctant hand, their follies and their
 “ weaknesses || :”—“ And his answer to the charge

† Exam. p. ii.

‡ Dialogues of the Dead with the Living. Printed for N. Conant and H. Payne.

§ Mr. G.’s own words, respecting *the apparent ridicule of hereditary succession* to the throne, indicate his mode of writing. “ *Satire and declamation*,” says he, “ may paint *these obvious topics in the most dazzling colours*.”

And that the Satirist or Declaimer may present facts to our view in whatever light he thinks proper, by artful colouring, this very instance is a proof: for we may either laugh, or be serious, according as we prefer the ridiculous or solid arguments of the Historian. See Decline and Fall, ch. vii. p. 171, 172.

|| Dialogues, p. 181. The author of the Dialogues puts these words into the mouth of Archbishop Langton:

“ of

“ of the adversaries of Christianity, is not given
 “ with half the glowing vivacity which sparkled
 “ in his style, when he held the accusation out to
 “ view *.”

Considered in this light, the sentiments of Dr. Gregory, on the true end of History, are most strictly applicable to Mr. Gibbon; though his censure was levelled at another Historian, no friend to Christianity.

“ The principal and most important end of History,” says that pleasing writer, “ is to promote the interests of liberty and virtue, and not merely to gratify curiosity. Impartial history will always be favourable to these interests. The elegance of its style and composition is chiefly to be valued as it serves to engage the reader’s attention. But if an Historian has no regard to what we here suppose should be the ultimate end of history, if he considers it only as calculated to give an exercise and amusement to the mind, he may undoubtedly make his work answer a very different purpose. The circumstances that attend all great events are so complicated, and the weaknesses and inconsistencies of every human character, however exalted and amiable, are so various, that an ingenious writer has an opportunity of placing them in a point of view that they may suit whatever cause he chooses to espouse. Under the specious pretence of a regard to truth, and a superiority to vulgar prejudices, he may render the best cause doubtful, and the most respectable character ambiguous. This may be easily done without any absolute deviation from truth; by only suppressing some circumstances, and giving a high colouring to others; by taking advantage of the frivolous

* Dialogues, p. 185.

and

and dissolute spirit of the age, which delights in seeing the most sacred and important subjects turned into ridicule ; and by insinuations that convey, in the strongest manner, sentiments which the author, from affected fear of the laws, or a pretended delicate regard to established opinions, seems unwilling fully and clearly to express. Of all the methods that have been used to shake those principles on which the virtue, the liberties, and the happiness of mankind depend, this is the most dangerous, as well as most illiberal and disingenuous. It is impossible to confute a hint, or to answer an objection that is not fully and explicitly stated, &c. †."

For my own part, to answer his censure, if an answer be necessary, I might plead, that in the first essay of so young an author, those embellishments of style could not reasonably be expected, which add lustre to the writings of an Historian, " who has employed several years of his life, and " several hundred pages, on the Decline and Fall " of the Roman Empire ;" and that to draw a comparison between the unformed style of a Bachelor of Arts, and the *polished diction* of Dr. Watson, is unfair and ungenerous : but on these things I will not lay stress, only reminding my reader that " the subject of my performance did not de- " mand ornaments of style, smartness of wit, or " accuracy of argument ; all that was necessary " to be done, was to relate matters of fact with " clearness and impartiality. And as little skill was " required in the execution of it, little or no me- " rit can be claimed from the result of it."

To use the words of the learned and able Dr. Burgh,

† Gregory's Comparative View, sect. iv. p. 221.

“ I have not, by any means, sought to lay before the world a chastised composition ; to convince, *not to amuse*, has been my sole endeavour ; my sole object, in an arduous and laborious undertaking, the advantage of my reader ; and my end I shall consider as happily attained to, if I shall decide the judgment of even a single hesitating Christian *.”

Mr. Gibbon with becoming gratitude acknowledges the indulgence of a *deluded* public, “ to his errors in the first volume of an important history, and their favourable reception of the whole work, which required even a *third* edition †.” In another place, and on a different occasion, speaking of polytheism, he tells us, that “ whilst the Roman magistrates acknowledged the general advantages of religion, they were convinced—that in every country the form of superstition, which had received the sanction of time and experience, was the best adapted to the climate, and to its inhabitants. That *they* knew, and valued the advantages of religion, as it is connected with civil government ‡.”

And when he apologises for their cruel persecution of the Christians, one reason which he assigns is, that “ by embracing the faith of the Gospel, the Christians incurred the supposed guilt of an unnatural and unpardonable offence. They dissolved the sacred ties of custom and education, violated the religious institutions of their country, and presumptuously despised whatever their fathers had believed as true, or had revered as sacred §.”

* Burgh's Inquiry, Advertisement, p. x.

† Vind. p. 16.

‡ History, p. 32, 33.

§ P. 523.

How

How far he has in these passages signed his own condemnation, let the *deluded* public judge. Is not the *nature* of Christianity, as well as of History, so *respectable that it ought not to be lightly violated by the rude hand of controversy**? Is not some regard to be paid to the established religion of his country? And is not some deference due from Mr. Gibbon to the received opinions of his ancestors, in the capacity of a good subject, especially as being himself a member of the legislature; or is Christianity so much more absurd than Paganism, that they who attack it are justified in their presumption?

For my own part, with regard to the favour of the public, I should esteem myself highly culpable, were not I also to return the sincerest thanks of a grateful heart for a reception of my work, favourable beyond my most sanguine expectations. I too, had I been so disposed, might have boasted of more editions than one, as the copies of the first impression were eagerly bought up; but I thought it my duty that my *Reply* should precede a second publication. I would by no means imitate Mr. Gibbon, as FAME is not my grand motive †, in suffering the same errors

* Vind. p. 5.

† The sublime Milton has properly distinguished between *true* and *false* Fame.

Satan, in his speech to our Saviour in the wilderness, says,

Wherefore deprive L. 23

“ All earth her wonder at thy acts, thyself

“ The *fame* and glory, *glory the reward*

“ That sole excites to high attempts, &c.

“ To whom our Saviour calmly thus reply’d.

— “ what is glory but the blaze of fame,

“ The people’s praise, if always praise unmix’d?

“ They praise, and they admire, they know not what,

“ And know not whom, ————— &c.

“ This

errors to continue through *three* editions; and if my *Examination* appears again, it shall not only be exempt from those blemishes, which my adversary has pointed out, but the inaccuracies shall be corrected which his sagacity did not discover. And I have taken care that the *Reply* should be printed in the same size as the *Examination*, that while they exist—which cannot be long, since Mr. Gibbon's authoritative voice has condemned them to oblivion—they may be bound and read together, and that the latter publication may correct and confirm the former.

Now that I am discharging the debt of gratitude, I must acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Gibbon himself, for stimulating me to undertake a laborious task, and to pursue this unusual course of study, at a time when the activity of youth might otherwise have been engaged in more amusing, but perhaps less profitable, reading.

But it was surely impolitic in him to depreciate my learning. For however just his accusation might be, yet he should have remembered, that my ignorance was his only safeguard. And he

- “ This is true glory and renown, when God,
- “ Looking on th' earth, with approbation marks
- “ The just man, and divulges him thro' heaven
- “ To all his angels, who with true applause
- “ Recount his praises,” &c.

Paradise Regain'd, book iii. l. 23—66.

So also in his *Lycidas*,

- “ *Fame* is no plant that grows on mortal soil,
- “ Nor in the glist'ring foil
- “ Set off to the world, nor in broad rumour lies ;
- “ But lives and spreads aloft by those pure eyes,
- “ And perfect witness of all-judging Jove ;
- “ As he pronounces lastly on each deed,
- “ Of so much *fame* in *heaven* expect thy meed.”

Lines 77—85.

must

must be conscious, that if I had directed my studies to the perusal of *Tillemont, Voltaire, Crevier, Le Beau*, and other French Historians, I should have discovered still more, how little he had consulted *original materials*; or rather proved, that it really was his *invariable practice* through the *whole* of his history, to transcribe the moderns, and by their aid and guidance to make a parade of the learning of the ancients.

But, be this as it may, if I have been able, with the little learning I have acquired, to hurt him so sensibly, he may perhaps learn an useful hint from the saying (which I have somewhere met with) of a General who was by his enemies represented on a medal sleeping, and Fortune winning his battles for him: *If, says he, I could do so much when I was asleep, let them take care that they do not awake me.*

But, above all, his allowing me “to assume the merit of extorting from him the notice which he had refused to more honourable foes,” requires my special thanks. I am sensible this distinction was not owing to my having the least pretensions to any superior excellence above his other opponents; but to my being singular in not alleviating the smart of his wounds, by the balm of unnecessary compliment. To those, who have shared with me our author’s declamatory invective, I believe, I need make little apology. The public has done justice to their labours, employed in exposing the superficial sophistry of Mr. Gibbon. And if I may judge from my own feelings, they will view that burlesque and scurrility towards which his genius is so strongly bent, with the contempt it deserves*.

* “*Mordear opprobriis falsis mutemque colores?*

“*Falsus honor juvat & mendax infamia terret*

“*Quem nisi mendacem & mendosum?*”

HORAT. Ep. i. 16.

For

For, to use the words of one who was attacked in a similar way : " I shall look upon that to be least of all an answer ; because it's no part of the dispute. For I'll never contest that point with him, but allow that he has no ill talent at farce and grimace *.

And, on this account, I have one more obligation to Mr. Gibbon ; which is, that he has hereby furnished me with abundance of excellent repartee, which I have not hesitated to employ, (with what success and propriety I presume not to say) on several occasions in the course of my *Reply*. Let him recollect, for the future, that Shylock's exclamation of "*a second Daniel*," supplied *Gratiano* with a most keen retort :

" *I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me the word.*"

I have now returned my adversary thanks for the advantages which I have received from him ; and he ought surely, in his turn, to acknowledge some obligation to be due to me and his other opponents, who have perhaps convinced him, that it will be necessary not only to *consult* but *faithfully to represent original materials*, that the public may have less reason to call in question either his learning or veracity, in the next volume.

I shall close this *Reply* in the very apposite words which the learned Dr. Bentley addresses to his opponent :

" Besides this, I may justly expect, that if he proceeds further upon this subject, he should freely acknowledge those faults, that I have refuted in

* Bentley's Preface to the Dissertation on Phalaris, p. 112.

his last work. I have done the like myself ; and I here sincerely declare, that I am not conscious of one error, that he observed in my *Examination*, which I do not own in my *Reply*. I design nothing but a search after truth, and will never be guilty of that mean dissingenuity, to maintain a fault that I am convinced of. I require therefore the same candour from him ; and if he does not perform it, I shall not reckon it as an answer. For if he has not either judgment enough to know when he's confuted, or sincerity enough to confess it, 'tis to no purpose at all to continue the controversy."

F I N I S.